Boston Public Library
3 9999 10522 739 9

No. _____

THE TRVSTEES OF THE
PVBLIC LIBRARY
OMNIVM
LVX
CIVIVM
OF THE CITY OF
BOSTON
1852 1878

_____

G.L.

AP2
.N7
Vol. 179
1904

5.5.0.

"BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY"

050-N82
179

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

EDITED BY GEORGE HARVEY.

VOL. CLXXIX.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
FRANKLIN SQUARE;
1904.

Copyright, 1904, by The North American Review Publishing Co.

All rights reserved.

INDEX

TO THE

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH VOLUME

OF THE

North American Review

ADAMS, BROOKS. Legal Supervision of the Transportation Tax, 371.
ADDAMS, JANE. The Present Crisis in Trades-Union Morals, 178.
Africa—The Transvaal after the War, 83; Conditions in the Congo Free State, 494.
A., H. Congress can Constitutionally Grant Independence to the Filipinos, 282.
Alaskan Boundary, The—Its Practicability and Cost, 65.
ALDEN, HENRY MILLS. Magazine Writing and Literature, 341.
Alien Colonies and the Children's Court, 731.
Amendment, A Sixteenth, 402.
American Colleges, The Self-Supporting Student in, 718.
American Literature — Is American Literature Bourgeois? 105.
American Naval Expenditures, British and, 887.
Americans, English Feeling toward, 815.
ANGLO-AMERICAN. A Foreign Estimate of Mr. Roosevelt, 118.
Anti-Trust Activity, Four Years of, 420.
Arbitrary Government, Do our People want an? 331.
Arbitration, International, 659.
Arms and Ammunition in Japan, 55.
AUERBACH, JOSEPH S. Is the Democratic Party Insincere? 748.
Australian Telegraph System, The, 741.
Austria—Automobile Legislation, 177.
Automobile Legislation, 168.

BACON, JOSEPHINE DASKAM. Is American Literature Bourgeois? 105
BALLANTINE, W. G. The Hyperbolical Teachings of Jesus, 446.
Baltic Fleet and the Northeast Passage, The, 161.
BANCROFT, HUBERT HOWE. The Folly of Chinese Exclusion, 263.
BANKS, ELIZABETH. The Educated American Drudge, 433.
Belgium—Automobile Legislation, 176; Conditions in the Congo Free State, 494.
BELLAIRS, CARLYON. British and American Naval Expenditures, 887.
BINGHAM, ROBERT. Sectional Misunderstandings, 357.
BLIND, KARL. Czarism at Bay, 481.
BLUMENSTEIN, WILLIAM H. Arms and Ammunition in Japan, 55.
Bonds, Present Status of Repudiated State, 873.
Bourgeois — Is American Literature Bourgeois? 105.
British and American Naval Expenditures, 887.
British Shipping and the State, 238.
BROOKS, SYDNEY. A Glance at World-Politics, 269.
BROWN, WILLIAM GARROTT. The Immediate Peril of the Negro, 824.

Calendar, The Reform of the, 569.
Canada—The Alaskan Boundary—Its Practicability and Cost, 65; Another Canadian Transcontinental Railway, 591.
Can Congress Constitutionally Grant Independence to the Filipinos? 282.
CARPENTER, ELIZABETH. More Truth About Women in Industry, 215.
Century of Politics, A, 801.
CHARLTON, JOHN. Another Canadian Transcontinental Railway, 591.
Children's Court, Alien Colonies and the, 731.
China in Transformation and the War, 1.
Chinese Exclusion, The Folly of, 263.
City Government—How Good City Government may be had, 543.
C., J. H. Congress Cannot Constitutionally Grant Independence to the Filipinos, 291.

Colleges, The Self-Supporting Student in American, 718.
COLQUHOUN, ARCHIBALD R. China in Transformation and the War, 1.
Conditions in the Congo Free State, 494.
Congo Free State, Conditions in the, 494.
Congress—Can Congress Constitutionally Grant Independence to the Filipinos? 282.
Constitution — A Sixteenth Amendment, 402.
CORTISSOZ, ROYAL. George Frederick Watts, 410.
COULTER, ERNEST K. Alien Colonies and the Children's Court, 731.
Czarism at Bay, 481.

Dark Rosaleen, The, 252.
Degeneracy of the German Army, The, 72.
Democratic Expansion, 96.
Democratic Party—Is the Democratic Party Insincere? 748.
Divorce—The Hyperbolical Teachings of Jesus, 446.
Do our People Want an Arbitrary Government? 331.
Drudge, The Educated American, 433.
DUNNING, W. A. A Century of Politics, 801.

Educated American Drudge, The, 433.
Education—Our National Superstition, 388; Higher Education in the West, 584; The Self-Supporting Student in American Colleges, 718.
England—The English in Tibet: A Russian View, 24; The Alaskan Boundary—Its Practicability and Cost, 65; The Transvaal after the War, 83; A Foreign Estimate of Mr. Roosevelt, 118; Automobile Legislation, 171; British Shipping and the State, 238; A Glance at World-Politics, 269; George Frederick Watts, 410; The Making of Modern Races, 526; Sir William Harcourt, 704; A Century of Politics, 801; English Feeling toward Americans, 815; British and American Naval Expenditures, 887; World-Politics, 457, 613, 772, 926.
English Feeling toward Americans, 815.
English in Tibet, The, 24.
ESCH, JOHN J. Should the Safety of Employees and Travellers on Railroads be promoted by Legislation? 671.
Expansion, Democratic, 96.

Feminine Occupations, Masculine and, 555.
Filipinos, Can Congress Constitutionally Grant Independence to the? 282.
Filipino View of the Philippine Problem, A, 860.
Finland, The Situation in, 913.
FINLANDER. The Situation in Finland, 913.
FINLAY, Sir ROBERT. International Arbitration, 659.
Folly of Chinese Exclusion, The, 263.
Foreign Estimate of Mr. Roosevelt, A, 118.
Four Years of Anti-Trust Activity, 420.

France—Automobile Legislation, 173; A Glance at World-Politics, 269; The Making of Modern Races, 526; Where and How is Russia to get her next Loan? 649; World-Politics, 627; A Century of Politics, 801.

GARNER, JAMES WILFORD. Four Years of Anti-Trust Activity, 420.
GARVIN, LUCIUS F. C. How Good City Government may be had, 543.
GENUNG, CHARLES HARVEY. The Reform of the Calendar, 569.
Germany—The Degeneracy of the German Army, 72; Automobile Legislation, 174; A Glance at World-Politics, 269; Working-men's Insurance in Germany, 439; World-Politics, 463, 622, 780, 933; The Making of Modern Races, 526; A Century of Politics, 801.
GILMAN, LAWRENCE. The New American Music, 868.
Glance at World-Politics, A, 269.
Government, Do our People Want an Arbitrary? 331.
GUYOT, YVES. Where and How Russia is to get her next Loan, 649.

HAINES, Brigadier-General PETER C. The Labor Problem on the Panama Canal, 42.
HAMILTON, ALLAN MCLANE, M.D. Sanity and Safety in Relation to Public Office, 504.
Harcourt, Sir William, 704.
HARPER, IDA HUSTED. Why Women cannot Vote in the United States, 30.
HARPER, WILLIAM R. Higher Education in the West, 584.
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 13.
Hell, The New, 128.
Higher Education in the West, 584.
HODGINS, THOMAS. The Alaskan Boundary—Its Practicability and Cost, 65.
HOWELLS, WILLIAM DEAN. The Son of Royal Langbrith, 136, 301; English Feeling toward Americans, 815.
How Good City Government may be had, 543.
Hyperbolical Teachings of Jesus, The, 446.

Immediate Peril of the Negro, The, 824.
Immigration, The Restriction of, 226.
Industry, More Truth about Women in, 215.
Insurance—Working-men's Insurance in Germany, 439; Suicide and Life Insurance, 698.
International Arbitration, 659.
Irish Muse, The, 685, 900.
Is the Democratic Party Insincere? 748.
Italy—Automobile Legislation, 177; The Making of Modern Races, 526; World-Politics, 787.

Japan—China in Transformation and the War, 1; Arms and Ammunition in Japan, 55; A Glance at World-Politics, 269; The "Yellow Peril" is the Golden Opportunity for Japan, 641.
Jesus, The Hyperbolical Teachings of, 446.

KANEKO, His Excellency Baron KENTARO. The "Yellow Peril" is the Golden Opportunity for Japan, 641.
KESTNER, Dr. FRITZ. Working-men's Insurance in Germany, 439.
KNIGHT, Professor GEORGE T. The New Hell, 128.

Labor Problem on the Panama Canal, The, 42.
LAWTON, W. H. Suicide and Life Insurance, 698.
LEE, VERNON. Nietzsche and the "Will to Power," 842.
Legal Supervision of the Transportation Tax, 371.
Legislation — Automobile Legislation, 168; Safety on Railroads promoted by Legislation, 671.
LEWIS, CHARLTON T. The Principle of Probation, 207.
LEWIS, ORLANDO F. The Self-Supporting Student in American Colleges, 718.
Life Insurance, Suicide and, 698.
Literature — Is American Literature Bourgeois? 105; Magazine Writing and Literature, 341; Literature in the New Century, 513.
Loan, Where and How Russia is to get her next, 649.
LODGE, HENRY CABOT. Why Theodore Roosevelt should be Elected President, 321.
LUSK, HUGH H. The Australian Telegraph System, 741.

MABIE, HAMILTON W. Nathaniel Hawthorne, 13.
MACLEOD, FIONA. The Irish Muse, 685, 900.
Magazine Writing and Literature, 341.
Making of Modern Races, The, 526.
Mangan, Clarence, 252.
Masculine and Feminine Occupations, 555.
MATTHEWS, BRANDER. Literature in the New Century, 513.
MELVILLE, Rear-Admiral G. W. The Baltic Fleet and the Northeast Passage, 161.
Misunderstandings, Sectional, 357.
MITCHELL, Dr. P. CHALMERS. The Making of Modern Races, 526.
Modern Races, The Making of, 526.
MONCHEUR, Baron. Conditions in the Congo Free State, 494.
MONTAGU, The Hon. JOHN SCOTT. Automobile Legislation, 168.
MORAWITZ, CHARLES. Obstacles to Reform in Turkey, 194.
More Truth about Women in Industry, 215.
Music, The New American, 868.

National Superstition, Our, 388.
Naval Expenditure, British and American, 887.
Negro, The Immediate Peril of the, 824.
NEVINSON, HENRY W. The Dark Rosaleen, 252.
New American Music, The, 868.
New Hell, The, 128.
Nietzsche and the "Will to Power," 842.
Northeast Passage, The Baltic Fleet and the, 161.

Obstacles to Reform in Turkey, 194.
Office, Public, Sanity and Safety in Relation to, 504.
OUKHTOMSKY, Prince ESPER. The English in Tibet: A Russian View, 24.

Panama Canal, The Labor Problem on the, 42.
Parker, Alton B.—Do our People want an Arbitrary Government? 331.
Penology—The Principle of Probation, 207.
Philippine Problem, A Filipino View of the, 860.
Philippines — Democratic Expansion, 96; Can Congress Constitutionally Grant Independence to the Filipinos? 282.
Politics, A Century of, 801.
Present Crisis in Trades-Union Morals, The, 178.
Present Status of Repudiated State-Bonds, 873.
Principle of Probation, The, 207.
Probation, The Principle of, 207.
Prohibition—Why? 550.

Races, The Making of Modern, 526.
Railways—Legal Supervision of the Transportation Tax, 371; Another Canadian Transcontinental Railway, 591; Safety on Railroads, 671.
Reform of the Calendar, The, 569.
Reminiscences of War, 600.
Repudiated State-Bonds, Present Status of, 873.
Restriction of Immigration, The, 226.
Roosevelt—A Foreign Estimate of Mr., 118; Why Theodore Roosevelt should be Elected President, 321.
Rosaleen, The Dark, 252.
RUSSELL, GEORGE W. E. Sir William Harcourt, 704.
Russia—China in Transformation and the War, 1; The English in Tibet: A Russian View, 24; The Baltic Fleet and the Northeast Passage, 161; A Glance at World-Politics, 269: Czarism at Bay, 481; The Making of Modern Races, 526; Where and How Russia is to get her next Loan, 649; A Century of Politics, 801; The Situation in Finland, 913; World-Politics, 468, 940.

Safety on Railroads, 671.
Sanity and Safety in Relation to Public Office, 504.
SCHIERBRAND, WOLF VON. The Degeneracy of the German Army, 72.
Sectional Misunderstandings, 357.
Self-Supporting Student in American Colleges, The, 718.
SEYMOUR, HORATIO W. Democratic Expansion, 96.
SHEEHAN, WILLIAM F. Do our People want an Arbitrary Government? 331.
Shipping, British, and the State, 238.
Should the Safety of Employees and Travellers on Railroads be promoted by Legislation? 671.
Situation in Finland, The, 913.
Sixteenth Amendment, A, 402.
Son of Royal Langbrith, The, 136, 301.
South, The—Sectional Misunderstandings, 357.
State-Bonds, Present Status of Repudiated, 873.

STONE, Lt.-Col. F. G. The Transvaal after the War, 83.
Suicide and Life Insurance, 698.
SULLIVAN, MARK. Present Status of Repudiated State-Bonds, 873.
SUMULONG, JUAN. A Filipino View of the Philippine Problem, 860.
Superstition, Our National, 388.
SWALLOW, SILAS C. Prohibition—Why? 550.
Switzerland—Automobile Legislation, 175.
SYLVA, CARMEN. Reminiscences of War, 600.

TAYLOR, BENJAMIN. British Shipping and the State, 238.
Telegraph System, The Australian, 741.
THOMAS, CHARLES W. A Sixteenth Amendment, 402.
Trades-Union Morals, The Present Crisis in, 178.
Transportation Tax, Legal Supervision of the, 371.
Transvaal, The, after the War, 83.
Trusts—Four Years of Anti-Trust Activity, 420.
Truth about Women in Industry, More, 215.
Turkey, Obstacles to Reform in, 194.

United States — Why Women cannot Vote in the United States, 30; The Labor Problem on the Panama Canal, 42; The Alaskan Boundary — Its Practicability and Cost, 65; Democratic Expansion, 96; Is American Literature Bourgeois? 105; A Foreign Estimate of Mr. Roosevelt, 118; Automobile Legislation, 176; The Present Crisis in Trades-Union Morals, 178; The Restriction of Immigration, 226; The Folly of Chinese Exclusion, 263; A Glance at World-Politics, 269; Can Congress Constitutionally Grant Independence to the Filipinos? 282; Why Theodore Roosevelt should be Elected President, 321; Do our People want an Arbitrary Government? 331; Sectional Misunderstandings, 357; Legal Supervision of the Transportation Tax, 371; Our National Superstition, 388; A Sixteenth Amendment, 402; Four Years of Anti-Trust Activity, 420; The Educated American Drudge, 433; The Making of Modern Races, 526; Prohibition—Why? 550; Safety on Railroads, 671; Suicide and Life Insurance, 698; The Self-Supporting Student in American Colleges, 718; Alien Colonies and the Children's Court, 731; Is the Democratic Party Insincere? 748; A Century of Politics, 801; English Feeling toward Americans, 815; The Immediate Peril of the Negro, 824; A Filipino View of the Philippine Problem, 860; The New American Music, 868; Present Status of Repudiated State-Bonds, 873; British and American Naval Expenditures, 887; World-Politics, 475, 635, 794, 947.

War—China in Transformation and the War, 1; Reminiscences of War, 600.
WARD, ROBERT DE C. The Restriction of Immigration, 226.
WASHBURNE, MARION FOSTER. Masculine and Feminine Occupations, 555.
Watts, George Frederick, 410.
WENDELL, Professor BARRETT. Our National Superstition, 388.
West, Higher Education in the, 584.
Where and How is Russia to get her next Loan? 649.
White Peril, The, 824.
Why Theodore Roosevelt should be Elected President, 321.
Why Women cannot Vote in the United States, 30.
"Will to Power," Nietzsche and the, 842.
Women—Why Women cannot Vote in the United States, 30; More Truth about Women in Industry, 215; The Educated American Drudge, 433; Masculine and Feminine Occupations, 555.
Working-men's Insurance in Germany, 439.
World-Politics, A Glance at, 269.
World-Politics—London, 457, 613, 772, 926; Berlin, 463, 622, 780, 933; St. Petersburg, 468, 940; Washington, 475, 635, 794, 947; Paris, 627; Rome, 787.

"Yellow Peril" is the Golden Opportunity for Japan, The, 641.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXII

JULY, 1904.

CHINA IN TRANSFORMATION AND THE WAR.

BY ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

ALTHOUGH very few people with any reputation as political students would care to risk a prophecy as to the probable dénouement of the present war, the writer is bold to foretell one thing. China will provide some surprises for the world at large, possibly before the conclusion of the war, inevitably after it is over. Russia and Japan present to the uninstructed observer the spectacle of two men fighting for the possession of a quasi-moribund third; but the supposed helpless one has opened at least one eye, if not very widely, and is eagerly watching the struggle.

Let us briefly recapitulate some of the principal developments in China which have been silently at work during the past few years. The most important change has undoubtedly been in the attitude of the Chinese towards Japan. This has been in the nature of a revolution, and the fact that it has been possible to overcome one of the strongest prejudices in the Chinese mind opens the gate to infinite possibilities.

When the *coup d'état* of 1898 reduced the reforming Emperor to a helpless puppet, exiled the leaders of the movement, and brought into power the most reactionary of Chinese parties, the Western World accepted the situation with apparent resignation. China must work out her own salvation, and Occidental efforts

Copyright, 1904, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY All Rights Reserved

must be concentrated simply on obtaining as many advantages for trade as were compatible with existing conditions. The attitude was not unreasonable, since it was ostensibly no one's special business to interfere in Chinese domestic affairs, and the action of any one Power or group of Powers would have been resented as much by the others as by China herself. Japan was on a different, and even more delicate, footing, and it is with consummate tact that she has contrived to obtain her ends. One of her most useful agencies has been the Legation at Pekin. Europeans who knew that city of diplomatists some years ago can remember the time when Great Britain dominated it politically and socially, as far as the foreign community was concerned. Then came the period of Russian ascendency, acquiesced in by Britain and her representatives with a sort of blind fatalism. The Russians brought Oriental tactics to bear; they got the best information, not merely by paying for it, but by devoting time, patience, and infinite pains to the task. Cassini, usually credited with a Machiavellian policy in Pekin, was in fact a figurehead, Pavloff, the type of a *rusé* Russian diplomat, being in reality the moving spirit of the Legation in these palmy days of Muscovite influence. The Chinese were hypnotized by Russia; the multiplication of Russian ambitions, the number of agencies employed (not the least important being that peculiar institution, the Russo-Chinese Bank), the steady march forward of Russian railways—all this bewildered the weak and venal party at the head of Chinese affairs. Li Hung-Chang, that cynical opportunist, was convinced that Russia was the strongest as well as the most insistent of the Powers who were clamoring at the gates of Pekin; and the man who in his earlier days had really tried to make his country strong, ended by throwing her into the arms of her most dangerous enemy. This was the period for Russia of bloodless victories, of shameless breaches of faith, of endless ambitions. For Britain, it was a period of fruitless remonstrance and loss of prestige, while Germany and France, in their several ways, made the most of the opportunity afforded by China's weakness. Japan alone was busy laying a countermine, while refraining carefully from any overt act of aggression. Gradually it became apparent that the Japanese Legation was the best informed in Pekin. At the same time, rivalries and dissensions divided the Russian party within itself, until at last the two chief agencies, the Legation

and the Russo-Chinese Bank, were barely on speaking terms. The Russian authorities in Manchuria squabbled with those at Pekin. Alexeieff, when he took over the reins of government as Vice-Tsar in the Far East, found a disunited staff, and his stiff militarism and consequent unpopularity did little to restore harmony.

Before all this happened, however, the Boxer incident upset the most careful diplomatic calculations. Japan was on the horns of a dilemma. She was obliged to march with the Allied Armies, and to take part in a punitive expedition against the very people whose *amour propre* she was most anxious not to wound. Only the extraordinary restraint and propriety of the Japanese troops, contrasted with the license of some of the Occidentals, saved the situation for her. Russia undoubtedly gained by the Boxer rising, since it gave her long-sought excuses for strengthening her hold on Manchuria; but Japan gained in moral stature proportionally in Chinese eyes, and, having proved to them that her soldiers were equal in the field to any of the allied troops (a testimony borne by the commanders of different nationalities), she was able also to point a moral to her quondam foes. The necessity of a trained army for China, with all the accompaniments of modern equipment, had long been realized by some of the foremost Chinese statesmen of the day, and by none more clearly than by the Generalissimo of the Northern Forces, Yuan Shih-Kai. This personage has accomplished the difficult task of balancing himself on two stools, being at once the favorite of the Empress Dowager and the favorer of reform. It is well known that he gained the confidence of that remarkable woman, Tszu-Hszi, by an act of treachery to the reformers; but it is also conceded by many who are in sympathy with the Reform party that, at the time of the *coup d'état,* their programme was revolutionary and unlikely to produce good results. Yuan Shih-Kai, having gained a firm footing by his action, has since that time quietly but firmly supported the less visionary reforms, and at the present time has achieved a unique position in China. He is regarded by his countrymen as their one hope in the future, and Europeans who know him speak in the highest terms of his character and capacity. His chief efforts have been bent to the training and equipment of an army in Northern China; for one of his maxims is, that policy without force is useless.

It is needless to say that Japan plays a great part in the con-

siderations of this Chinese statesman. It must be remembered that, unlike Li Hung-Chang, he has resisted the influence of Russia, while to Germany he has been a thorn in the side (in Chihli and Shantung), resisting her attempts at encroachment, barring her way to concessions, and generally making himself as unpleasant as possible. Nevertheless, while making every use of Japanese methods in drilling and equipping his men, he is not, as is sometimes represented, a Japanese tool. His motto is "China for the Chinese." He expresses vigorously the belief that, whichever party wins in the present struggle, China will not be a gainer, unless—and we can imagine that his mental reservation on this subject would be "*unless* China can bring forward a policy backed by force." The lesson taught by Russia in Manchuria, by Germany in Shantung, and by the Allied Armies as they marched to Pekin has sunk into the hearts of the Chinese, to whom any less forcible lesson would have been useless. Yuan Shih-Kai has plenty of sympathy in his aspiration to give his country an arm of defence.

Space forbids that the growth of Japanese reforms in China should be described in detail, although it is a most interesting subject and can be traced backwards, as it were, through the ramifications of Chinese society to its various sources. Japan took up the task where Europe had practically laid it down, and she did not build on any of the old foundations. Religious propaganda had always been regarded as the only root-force which could accomplish reform in China, and the heroism and devotion displayed in this cause by Occidental missionaries has been unsurpassed in the history of religion. Deeply as one must sympathize with the Men and the Cause, it is impossible to be satisfied with the result. Japan had two great advantages at the outset of her campaign,—she had the written language as a means of communication, and she had a certain community of religious and social traditions. Although pan-Buddhism is actually playing a part in the Chinese-Japanese *entente,* it is more as a racial than as a religious bond. The radical difference in the Oriental and Occidental attitude towards religion is one of the strangest and most discouraging facts which the Christian missionary has had to face. It is a wall between the races. Japan and China are on the same side of the wall: they can understand each other without shouting. Practically, the opportunity of acquiring many things which had

become in his eyes desirable, without any fear of having his morals questioned or his traditions disturbed, has inclined the Chinese towards the Japanese rather than the Occidental form of modernization.

From this vantage-ground the Japanese began their campaign—how? By the intensely modern method of creating a native press! Europe has put a weapon in the hands of the Orient which she will polish and use in her own way. Let it not be imagined that the views of Europe and her civilization spread by the Japanese-controlled Chinese press are those that have currency among the Anglo-Saxon peoples! It would be a distinct shock to the conceit of many people who are in the habit of patting Japan on the back as an apt pupil, to realize the extent to which the pupil has diagnosed the weakness of the teacher while utilizing as much as possible his strength. The effect produced on the most remote parts of China by the introduction of newspapers has been electric. In a population extraordinarily literate and inquisitive, literature had hitherto been entirely confined to the classics, with the exception of a few sheets, circulated chiefly in the seaport towns and containing little that could reach the populace. One of the first results was the exodus of students to the Japanese colleges, of whom there were last year in Tokyo alone over one thousand, and among these many of the influential class. Japanese teachers have largely replaced the Europeans in the Chinese colleges. The tradition that high-class Chinese could not leave home without losing caste has been dispelled by the visits of princes of the blood to foreign countries, and by the appointment of sons of mandarins of high rank to the suites of the ministers in London and Washington.

One of the most remarkable and far-reaching changes, however, is to be found in the revolution which has taken place in examination questions for the degrees which open the road to official appointment. In the place of the stereotyped classical allusions, tests of memory, and so forth, we find in the last year's papers questions as to the significance of the Monroe Doctrine, the value of the Trans-Isthmian canal and Trans-Siberian railway, the meaning of Free Trade and Protection, the characteristics of the educational systems of different countries, and the essentials of a pure and efficient civil service. The new departure is in many cases to be traced to the influence of missionary-disseminated

literature, and, in particular, to the Society for the Diffusion of Christian and General Knowledge, which, in later years, has worked on the broadest non-sectarian basis of education. The most significant questions, however, relate to the progress of Japan and whether she is "merely following European footsteps." Simultaneously, an industrial *entente* has been effected between China and Japan. Workmen are crowding Japanese arsenals and factories to be taught the use of modern machinery and methods, and the East Asiatic League, which is the organ of the *entente,* devotes itself largely to promoting this side of Chinese reform.

Who can doubt, in the face of all this evidence, that China is on the eve of a new era, and that the new reform movement, of which Japan is the prime instigator, will be successful, because it does not centre in any one district, class of society or political party, but has centres of activity in the army, the mandarin class, the *literati* and the industrial class. All have been touched with the magic wand, while the widely disseminated literature of the Japanese press carries new light to the farthest ends of China. In this connection, it must be remembered that to the Imperial Maritime Customs, under their British Director-General, China owes one of the most useful developments which make for reform. A network of postal service has been spread over the length and breadth of the eighteen provinces, which makes the dissemination of the newspapers and literature possible. As this article is being written, there comes a communication from Sir Robert Hart, in which he unfolds a great scheme of reform for China. The time chosen appears inopportune, the scheme itself is ill-balanced and chimerical; but that such a suggestion should emanate from so conservative a man, who from long residence and association has become more Chinese than many a Chinaman, is additional proof of the profound changes in the Celestial Empire.

The world, which has been almost electrified by the immense successes gained by Japan so far—successes which no subsequent events can rob of their significance—has given hardly sufficient credit to one Japanese arm. It is to her careful and systematic studies, as represented in her truly wonderful Intelligence Department, that Japan owes most. Russia, we say, was taken by surprise. But why? Because Japan, who had been conducting negotiations with the utmost patience and propriety, knew the moment to strike. It was the exact moment when world-condi-

tions were most favorable. It is inconceivable that Japan would have risked her very existence in so vital a struggle, had she not been fully cognizant of, and made allowance for, various factors which did not appear on the surface. Japan has played no Machiavellian game, she has only utilized the superior advantages of her Oriental reserve and pertinacity in getting information and keeping it quiet; and, coming as an outsider into the game of Occidental politics, she has perhaps seen more than the old performers. It is impossible within the limits of this article to follow out the many threads of policy which have been converging in Eastern Asia; but a very few will suffice.

Let us take recent British action in Asia. One of our great difficulties in Asia has always been our lack of really reliable information, which has been chiefly obtained through a few of our own Asiatic subjects whom we have deigned to employ. The British method of dividing Asia into compartments and treating them separately has also been against us. Fortunately for Japanese aims, we have recently had an Indian Viceroy of more intelligence and force of character than is usual, and a clearer understanding of the Asiatic situation as a whole was vouchsafed to this Viceroy than to any of his predecessors. Incidentally, we must all remember that a Japanese gentleman of education passed a number of months in the Tibetan capital recently, and that the revelation of the Russo-Chinese understanding respecting Tibet came through Pekin. The origin of this understanding is not obscure, and notwithstanding the repeated and explicit denials of the existence of any such agreement the evidence in the possession of British authorities is conclusive. While Russian influence declined at Pekin, Chinese influence has been discredited at Lhasa, and the Russians provided a second string to their bow in the shape of a friendly intercourse with the Dalai-Lama, whom they actually provided with a Russian (Buriat) counsellor. The British move into Tibet, besides happening at an auspicious moment for Japanese interests, which demand that every distraction possible should hamper her adversary, has the effect of demonstrating to the Chinese the vulnerability of that Russian shield on which they had relied. The writer is inclined to think that China will welcome a settlement of the Tibetan question which recognizes her own suzerainty in a part of the Celestial Empire which was fast slipping from her grasp.

The recent *entente* between Britain and France has been discussed *ad infinitum* on both sides of the Atlantic, and the writer has very little that is novel to add. It has rather escaped notice, however, that a certain docility on the part of Britain as regards disputed points in connection with Siam, the abandonment of railway schemes which might conflict with French ambitions in southwestern China, as well as the more open concessions in North Africa and Newfoundland, have been the foundations of the newly cemented friendship. At the same time, there has been a renewal of British activity in other quarters of Asia from which we hope good results, and the conclusion to which one is driven in regarding these moves in the diplomatic game is that, in Asia at least, British foreign policy has quite recently become more coherent. Looked on as a whole, we can see a distinct plan, a focus as it were; a partial breaking down of the "compartment" theory. However that may be, Japan, watching the game very closely, has clearly perceived that we have achieved the task of detaching France from an inconvenient interpretation of the Dual Alliance, at the very moment when it might have been dangerous to Japanese interests. Japan, moreover, has no longer to fear a repetition of the Triple Alliance, which was so inimical to her interests after a previous war. Germany, although she began her career of Pacific expansion with so much vigor, is reduced to a rather minor part in the European chorus. She is at present devoting her energies to ingratiating herself with Russia, to working up the "Yellow Peril" bogey, and incidentally to getting Yuan Shih-Kai into trouble if possible, for nothing would be more unwelcome to Germany than an armed, efficient China. A very plausible opportunity may present itself in the question of Chinese neutrality.

There is no doubt that the Chinese government is genuinely desirous of preserving a neutral attitude and is urged thereto by Japan, Britain and the United States. For China to become involved in the struggle would not only open the door for Russian retaliation at many vulnerable points, but would inevitably lead to an appeal for intervention on the part of Russia, which would certainly mean further spoliation of China. At the same time, the position is one of peculiar difficulty and danger. Manchuria itself is chiefly inhabited by Chinese from the eighteen provinces, with a mere handful of Manchus; and these, by a General Order

of Alexeieff, are to be held responsible for acts committed by the robber bands which infest the country. As the Occidental press just now contains frequent reference to these "Chunchuses,"* it may be useful to give a slight description of them.

Manchuria has always, since the Chinese throne fell under a Manchu domination, been the Alsatia of the eighteen provinces. When the conquering Manchus were engaged in enforcing their supremacy in China and draining their own country of men to place in official posts throughout the Empire, and to act as Imperial troops, China, in return, sent back a stream of immigrants to sparsely populated Manchuria. These were chiefly agriculturists or traders, but the lax state of law attracted all who had overstepped the bounds of law in their own country. Malefactors of every class found refuge there; and a large number, banding together, began to make a living by preying on the more industrious immigrants. So systematic did their depredations become, as Chinese commerce developed, that they nearly killed the goose that laid the golden eggs, and at length a compromise was effected which was truly Chinese. The Hung-hu-tsz actually established their own insurance office in Newchwang, where, for a consideration, the merchant, travelling inland, was provided with a little red flag (the Robber Sign), and enjoyed immunity from depredations in the country infested with marauders. In recent years, many of these bands, defying Chinese authority, smuggled improved weapons across the northern (Russian) frontier, and they are not only fairly well armed, but are well mounted and have the mobility, reckless daring, and ingenuity common to such freebooting gangs in every age and every clime. Their headquarters are in remote and inaccessible, but fertile, recesses of the mountainous region between Mongolia and Manchuria. Their numbers vary greatly according to the season and the character of the season. Any one who has had experience of such bands knows the peculiar relations they are able to establish with the village inhabitants, who are at once their victims and their allies. No more difficult problem exists in warfare than that of dealing with such an enemy, who will not come into the open; Americans have not forgotten their experiences with the Ladrones in the Philippines.

* "*Hung-hu-tsz*" (or "*tzu*") is the correct name, and means "Red-beard." Chun-chuse is evidently the Anglicized version of the Russian form, Khunkuse or Khunkuz.

Alexeieff's order, "All Chinese harboring Chunchuses will be shot, and their villages burnt," if carried into effect, will mean the devastation of the whole country and the practical extermination of a large section of the people; or else it will drive the greater portion of the people into outlawry as robbers themselves. The writer has always held very strongly that these drastic measures are worse than useless in dealing with this difficulty, and they have invariably failed wherever put in force. The really peaceful villager, with a truly Chinese desire to be left alone and to practise his occupation without interference, is placed between the devil and the deep sea. He is denied arms, and is therefore helpless before the Hung-hu-tsz, who have terrorized him and his fathers from time immemorial. On the other hand, he has the fear of Russia before his eyes, and he knows from grim experience how heavy Russia's hand can be. Not content with this measure against the robbers, Alexeieff has actually promulgated an order by which Chinese officials may be arrested on mere suspicion of supplying information to the Japanese.

Just across the border, an imaginary line, on one side of which this state of affairs exists, is an army of twenty or thirty thousand under General Ma. The situation is, therefore, a delicate one. A spark may set fire to the powder magazine. Yuan Shih-Kai, as Generalissimo of the Northern Forces, is clearly a person on whom much depends.

There are already many signs that the Hung-hu-tsz are to play an important part in the war. Russia is ready to declare that they are employed by Japan, and the only absolute argument against this hypothesis is the proved prudence of the Japanese, who would place themselves in a false position by so doing and might precipitate the very thing—intervention—which they are most anxious to avoid. As a matter of fact, the Russians have already tried to utilize them as irregular forces, but the execution of several of their leaders (most flagrant marauders) has alienated all these lawless bands, who regarded it as an act of treachery. They may not love the Japanese, but they are shrewd enough to wish to be on the winning side, and the successes of Japan must have won her many adherents. It would be difficult to disprove the charge, of Japanese complicity with the Robbers, and still more difficult to prove that the Robbers are quite independent of Chinese aid or encouragement. Chinese soldiers in disguise may

well be found within their ranks, and although in reality they may be deserters from the army it will be impossible to prove this clearly. While the attitude of the Government and of the Chinese General remains correct, it would be in the highest degree unreasonable to set up a charge of breach of neutrality; but there are evident signs that such a charge will be made on the very slightest pretext. It is to be hoped that the Powers whose interests demand that China should be kept out of the fray, are exercising special vigilance in this matter, and are prepared to meet any charge with evidence of its unreason.

A move on the part of Russia which should meet with universal disapproval in the civilized world, is the recent order as to the employment of convicts from Saghalin as soldiers in Manchuria. Any one who has experience of Russian communities in Siberia and Manchuria is aware that even the less desperate criminals, of whom the lowest stratum of society is formed, are a constant menace to property and even to life. But the Saghalin convicts are criminals of the worst type, brutalized still further by the circumstances of existence in their horrible exile. Surely no civilized nation has ever called into its service men of such calibre, and when the complicated conditions of the country are taken into consideration, and it is remembered that these men may be called on to mete out justice to unarmed villagers, to maintain order—they who have set the laws of order in defiance in the most desperate way—and to uphold the honor of "Holy Russia" among a pagan people, one may well tremble for the consequences. This action is a curious commentary on the statement given to the world in the pages of this REVIEW by Count Cassini. He tells us that "the flower of enlightened civilization blooms through a land that a few years ago was a waste." Count Cassini's picture of Manchuria blooming under Russian rule inevitably recalls that fatal name of Blagovestchensk, and he is prepared with a statement concerning that episode which is hardly paralleled for audacity. We are told that the Boxers, aided by Chinese regular troops commanded by Chinese officers, crossed the Ameer and attacked Blagovestchensk. One feels that Count Cassini's defence of his country's policy cannot but lose from such palpable distortion of facts well known and attested by reliable witnesses.

Of the many considerations which arise out of the points raised in this article, the one which the writer is most anxious to press

home is the delicate and dangerous position of China and the necessity for preparedness on the part of those Powers which desire to keep her out of the fray. We have seen that the course of events, not merely in the Far East, but in other parts of Asia, makes it likely that Russia will be specially desirous of embroiling China, whose influence in Central Asia can no longer be regarded as pro-Russian; but we have also seen that the present grouping of Occidental Powers is sufficiently favorable to Japan to secure her a fair field. That she relied on this is as certain as that she gauged the fact, long before it was palpable to Europe, that the war would not array the whole Russian Empire against her. We know now that it is a war waged by the bureaucracy, who are not even unanimous among themselves; and when we remember this, and remember that some of the leading Russian statesmen are opposed to the headlong policy which led to the war, and that the bulk of the people are indifferent, if not averse, to it, we may indulge the hope that the conflict will result in a more even and permanent adjustment of Far-Eastern politics than has hitherto been possible, without that absolute ruin of either of the combatants which our Job's comforters are fond of predicting.

As an old friend and admirer of the wonderful Chinese Empire and a profound believer in its future of prosperity and usefulness, if only it could accomplish domestic reform, the writer cannot help cherishing the hope that this favorable solution will be found possible. If Yuan Shih-Kai fulfils the promise he has given—he is only forty-five years old—he may prove the leader for whom China has waited so long. Removed from the deadly pressure of the Muscovite on the north, China could deal effectively with the aggressions of the foreigner; and, with moderate measures of reform, she would be able to develop her unrivalled resources and maintain her independence as a nation, and yet afford a market for the great expansionist commercial Powers.

ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE.

BY HAMILTON WRIGHT MABIE.

THERE is such general agreement touching the quality of Hawthorne's genius and the rank of his work in American literature, that the centennial of his birth invites comment on the conditions under which he developed his gifts, rather than a fresh estimate of the artistic value of his contribution to our prose. Our literature is singular in that, alone among the literatures of the greater races, it had beginnings but no youth; it was born highly sophisticated, if not full-grown. Its strength lies in vigor of conviction rather than in depth of experience; in definiteness of aim rather than in rich spontaneity; in moderation, poise and integrity rather than in passion, tidal flood of energy, surrender to imperious moods. It is, so far, the record of a clear-minded, idealistic, well-balanced people, bent on executive rectitude, rather than of a people deeply moved by the mystery and pathos of life, stirred by impulses which rise from the instincts and are stronger than reason, swept out of its moorings from time to time by mysterious currents from unexplored tracts of its nature. This does not mean that Americans are commonplace; it does mean that their art has not, save in rare moments, caught and held the force and splendor of elemental passion.

The Jews began the written record of their experience, both in idea and in action, with reports of cosmic forces subdued to vast ends, and of men stirring into life with immense vitality; the Greeks told the story of a great war set in motion by a passion for a beautiful woman; the Germans recited moving tales of gods and men, with swords bared in a thousand hours of reckless measuring of strength with strength; the English brought with them the legend of a hero slaying a monster; the French beguiled the slow-moving hours of the Middle Ages with the doings

of Alexandre, of Charlemagne, or Arthur; the Spaniards fed their youth with the brave adventures of the Cid; while the Irish were loving without counting the cost, and fighting for the sport of it, as far back as the time of Cuchulain. In epic, ballad, lyric and story, the first records of the older races have to do with reckless fighting, audacious adventure, lawless and uncalculating passion.

Our writing begins, on the other hand, with the reports of men who had put romance away with resolute hands, and were determined to achieve definite and rational ends in a New World; who were not without awe of its mystery, but who were chiefly concerned to get it under tillage, and to turn its resources to practical account. Our literature of fiction begins with "Ethan Brand," "Peter Rugg," "The Fall of the House of Usher," "Wieland: or the Transformation!" The significance of these facts has not yet been fully disclosed; when it is, we shall understand Poe and Hawthorne better.

The ancestors of Hawthorne left England while the memory of Shakespeare and his contemporaries was still fresh; the settlers of the next century might have read Fielding and Smollett in the first editions; but in Hawthorne, Emerson, Poe and Irving there is no hint of the sixteenth-century passion or of the unashamed virility of the eighteenth century. A sudden maturity seems to have descended on the men of the New World. Puritanism had sublimated life by denying some of its instincts and putting others outside the pale of written speech; and harassing dangers and inexorable work gave elemental impulses safe channels of expression. The men of New England were engrossed by the necessity of saving their souls, and the men of Virginia and South Carolina by the pleasure of a free, hospitable, active, out-of-door life. There were intellectual interests, scholarly traditions and well-read libraries North and South; but life was essentially practical, and art kept company with none of the early emigrants from the Old to the New World.

The New World was so new that all the rudimentary work of civilization had to be done over again; it was without accumulations of legend, romance, learning, religion or society; everything had to be made out of hand. This work was done by several hundred thousand families, forming a long and often defenceless skirmish line in a country full of unorganized but relentless

enemies. These families came from different countries, or from different classes of society. They had little acquaintance with one another, and in that period absence of knowledge meant presence of suspicion and distrust. The means of communication were few, the distances great, and travel was slow, laborious and expensive. When Hawthorne, Emerson, and Poe were born, these scattered communities had taken on a formal unity as the result of a struggle for the right to manage their own affairs, and they had acted together for three or four decades rather by force of circumstances than by reason of any deep sense of community of feeling or of aims. The former colonists were living under one government, but they had not become a nation.

The prophetic sense in Emerson divined the national idea long before it had taken deep root or found clear expression in the minds of his contemporaries; but Hawthorne and Poe, being primarily, and by the compulsion of a positive if somewhat sublimated genius, artists, and concerned largely with the forms of things, had no such divination; and while both had behind them the distinctive and highly organized life of sections, neither had the ample background, nor was either fed by the deep and rich influences, of a highly developed national life. Hawthorne was a New-Englander rather than an American; there were few Americans in his time. "At present," he writes, "we have no country, at least none in the sense an Englishman has a country. I never conceived, in reality, what a true and warm love of country is till I witnessed it in the breasts of Englishmen. The States are too various and extended to form really one country. New England is quite as large a lump of earth as my heart can really take in." In Poe there is no hint of the wealth of association, memory and experience, capitalized by a race which has lived together for centuries, which one feels in Chaucer or Tennyson; in Hawthorne there is no suggestion of the vast, deep, rich movement of an old society which one feels in Balzac, in Thackeray and Tourgenieff. The absence of national consciousness and of those forces which flow with tidal volume through great communities and make them as one in the crisis of experience, and the absorption of men in practical affairs, are factors of the first importance in any endeavor to understand or estimate the work of Hawthorne, Emerson and Poe, the most important figures in American literature.

Neither Hawthorne nor Poe touched the life of his time; nor, for that matter, did they touch with the bare hand the life of any time. Poe made his own world, fashioning it out of phantasy as boldly as he shaped the men and women of his imagination. We seem always to be looking at Hawthorne's figures from a distance; we never touch hands with them; they never speak directly to us; we do not expect to come upon them in any of those chance meetings which sometimes bring us face to face with Becky Sharp, Maggie Tolliver and Silas Lapham. Even in "The Blithedale Romance," or "The Marble Faun," where we are within speaking and hearing distance, the drama unfolds before us in a silence as deep as that which enfolds "The Scarlet Letter." Emerson spoke to the soul of his countrymen with the sustained nobility of deep insight and the persuasive eloquence of a very noble and sane outlook on life in its integrity and wholeness; but in Emerson it is altitude rather than mass which gives his work its spiritual distinction. He was not unaware of a certain thinness of tone in it, a certain lack of mass; for he notes in himself what he calls "lack of constitution."

There was no lack of sensitive genius in Emerson, Hawthorne or Poe, but there were distinct deficiencies in their background and in their period; to none of them did a rich national life give its fulness of power, its broad, deep humanness; to none of them did a warm, unfolding air of sympathy bring its liberating force, its benignant and fertilizing influence. Emerson wrote much about his age, but chiefly about its possibilities; he escaped habitually into the upper air from the pressure of its hard conditions. Poe gives no hint anywhere, save in a few critical discussions, that he had any concern with the movements of his time or any interest in them. Hawthorne was a close and shrewd observer; but when his imagination begins to play, he is off and away as instinctively as the poet of most vagrant genius.

For all these writers, and especially for Hawthorne and Poe, art was a refuge from a country which did not feed the imagination, and a life which did not lend itself readily to imaginative interpretation. If there had been literary scholars in America at the beginning of the nineteenth century, they would probably have predicted a literature of heroic figures, of the idealization of action, of realistic devotion to fact and force; instead of this reproduction in art of provincial and local activities and energies,

there came a literature notable chiefly for its detachment from actualities, its sublimation of passion, its purity and distinction. Not until our own time has the American writer begun to deal at first hand and with his whole heart with contemporary conditions in this country. "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and other stories which seem at first glance to refute this statement, really confirm it; not one of these was written with the eye on the facts of life, or for the love of those facts.

Isolated by the fact that his genius was of greater capacity than the volume of life about him, and that it was of a delicacy and subtlety which that life could not furnish with congenial material, Hawthorne was isolated also by the force of ancestral facts, and by his temperament. He has left an impression of his ancestors which is at once curiously impersonal and intensely personal; from the first emigrant who bore his name, "grave, bearded, sable-cloaked and steeple-crowned," treading the streets with a stately port, with his Bible and his sword; his son, so conspicuous in the persecution of the witches that "their blood may fairly be said to have left a stain upon him"; to the hardy ship-masters of a later century, who began before the mast and retired to the leisure of comfortable age from the quarter-deck. There were survivals of all these ancestors in Hawthorne; landsman as he was, he was rarely out of hearing of the sea; the only practical occupations to which he put his hand kept him on or near the wharfs, and the notes of his consular experience betray his constant interest in sailors and his instinctive feeling of relationship with them. It was, however, by the earlier and sterner men of his name that his imagination was most deeply attracted. Removed from them by generations of seafaring experience, liberated from their intense and provincial ideas of life and duty, he lived in and through the experiences of his Puritan ancestors with the marvellous penetration of a genius of rare psychologic affinities and insight. "I know not whether those ancestors of mine," he writes, "bethought themselves to repent, and ask pardon of heaven for their cruelties; or whether they are now groaning under the heavy consequences of them, in another state of being. At all events, I, the present writer, as their representative, hereby take shame upon myself for their sakes, and pray that any curse incurred by them — as I have heard, and as the dreary and unprosperous condition of the race, for many a long year

back, would argue to exist — may be now and henceforth removed."

Isolation was a potent fact in those impressionable years when he was finding himself and coming slowly into possession of his imagination and of the materials with which he was to work. The twelve years in the little room under the eaves in his mother's house in Salem, from 1825 to 1837, included the entire period of his earliest maturity, from his twenty-first to his thirty-third year. While most youths of genius were getting acquainted with life through experience, he was looking at it from a distance and with meditative eyes. Of action as a form of self-expression he knew nothing at a time when action solicits and compels the great majority of men.

He was not only shut off from his fellows, spending long days in reading, or dreaming, or composing and taking his walks at night, but he was separated from his own family. The emphasis on personality, which was the note of the Puritan view of life and the source of its strength and weakness, has produced a peculiar type of morbid character in New England, the distinguishing mark of which is its passion for solitude. In the South, where the social instinct has been highly developed, the "crank" is found at the post-office and the country store; in New England he lives by himself on the outskirts of the village, or in some lonely farmhouse; and the New England communities are few in which no hermit is found.

During the long years of her widowhood, Hawthorne's mother not only lived apart from the world, but from the members of her own family. His sisters followed their mother's example and lived in their own rooms. In such a ghostly atmosphere the young man succumbed to the prevailing habit, and his meals were often left at his locked door and eaten without human fellowship in the solitude of his room. "We do not even *live* at our house," he once said. In the morning he studied, in the afternoon he wrote and in the evening he read; neither visitors nor friends knocked at his door. Delight in the sense of being at home and the opportunities of reading and dreaming gave the early years of this monastic life keen interest, and contributed not a little to the fostering of his rare genius and his delicate and sensitive talent; but, as time passed, the monotony of his life, its unnatural isolation, involving the denial of the instincts of his youth, bore heavily

on his spirits, and bred a depression that chilled his imagination and checked the creative impulse in him. Driven back upon himself by the lack of a warm, compelling life about him, such as bore Shakespeare on a flood-tide to the largest prosperity of growth and art; finding nothing in the plain, sincere, but unimaginative community in which he lived to absorb or vitalize his imagination; denied his share in the sympathy and genial warmth of normal family life, Hawthorne took refuge in a world which was full of moral reality, but which was as remote from the actual world as if he had created it out of hand.

Neither in faith nor in practice was he a Puritan. He saw life as the Puritan had once seen it, with clear and authoritative insight; but he saw it under radically different conditions and with the immense modification of the artistic temperament. Through all manners, customs, dress, institutions, he saw, as the Puritan had seen, the interior reality—the life of the soul. It was as if the externalities of life had no separate existence for him; he was aware only of the immortal element in the show and movement of things. And this immortal element was present in his view, not as a free, expanding energy under normal conditions; but crippled, baffled, beaten about by circumstances; distorted and misshapen not only by failure and weakness, but by a deep-going corruption; continually driven back upon itself until it groped blindly in the mysteries of morbid experience. Hawthorne's Puritan inheritance showed itself in his absorption in the problems not only of the spirit, but of the spirit out of harmony with itself and at odds with its own nature.

American fiction began with the application of the most subtle psychology to the study and analysis of character, and Hawthorne, Browne and Poe are the progenitors of Mr. Henry James and of Mrs. Wharton; with this radical difference, that the earlier writers of fiction did not apply their methods to living tissues; they dealt almost entirely with the past or with phantoms of their own creation. Hawthorne's Puritan inheritance determined the bent of his mind, and gave him the key to a world already fast vanishing below the horizon of thought; but his genius, which was fundamentally artistic and therefore non-Puritan, compelled him to look at the world of the Puritan spiritual tragedy from a distance; and when he fastened on the same aspects of experience in contemporary life, as in "The Blithedale Romance" and "The

Marble Faun," he held his figures at arm's length, and never for a moment do we lose consciousness of the fact that we are "moving about in worlds not realized." His inheritance and his genius were at odds in Hawthorne; the temperament was sympathetic with the inheritance, and his way of living prepared for and invited the ghostly figures which preoccupied his meditations. But his temperament was also artistic and craved color, vitality, form, beauty; hence the extraordinary firmness and fineness of tissue in his work, its precision of statement and its suggestiveness to the imagination, its beauty born in a feeling not only for the subtle and delicate resources of diction, but for the mystery of relationship between spirit and symbol. Hence, also, the sense of remoteness which is never absent from his work; the feeling that we are looking at his men and women through a veil. In the most poignant moments in "The Scarlet Letter," we are never pierced to the heart as, for instance, in "Anna Karénina," in "Crime and Punishment," in "Poor Folk."

Hawthorne impresses us deeply, but he does not agitate us. When he lays the human soul bare, as he lays bare the soul of Dimmesdale, the process is so deliberate and searching that, when we reach the supreme moment of torture, we seem to have come to it through an intellectual rather than an emotional experience. Even when Hawthorne moves rapidly and with a modicum of analysis to the end of the tale, we seem to be reading, not the annals of our time, but the story of

> "... old, unhappy, far-off things,
> And battles long ago."

Hawthorne was not only the forerunner of the psychologists in fiction, but he was also the prophet of the symbolists. He does not sacrifice the ethical motive, the searching disclosure of character, to the beauty and suggestiveness of the symbol; but the tales and novels present marvellous symbolic effects, and are unfolded with a rich circumstance of symbolism that takes possession of the imagination, and excludes all other objects save those which contribute to the subtle and complete unfolding of the drama. The note-books bear witness on every page to the closeness and exactness of his observation; he saw objects, both natural and human, with perfect clarity of vision. If he lacks Thoreau's inimitable knowledge of the detail of natural life, he has the same sharpness

of sight. Nothing escapes him, and nothing is outlined with a careless hand. But the moment a figure appears in the landscape, the landscape begins to relate itself to the figure, to take on its character, to wear the color of its mood, to suggest its innermost experience. As in Poe's tales, familiar things under the clearest sky, in the broadest light, become charged with mystery and meaning, and take possession of the reader's senses while the actors take possession of his imagination. Like Poe, Hawthorne begins by slowly and certainly excluding everything that distracts attention, and gradually closes all avenues of escape until both actors and spectators are isolated in a world remade by the temperament, the passion, the sin which are bearing fruit in the disintegration or reformation of a human soul. The daughter of Rappaccini becomes as deadly as the flowers in her father's garden, and there is not a flower among them which is not exhaling its poison from the minute the spectator sets foot within the fateful place.

The isolation of Hawthorne's life seems, in the light of his work, of a piece with his segregation of the world of his phantasy from the world of reality. The most devoted and chivalrous of lovers to the very end of his life, the most companionable and fascinating of fathers, a loyal friend to the few who possessed his heart and broke through his reserve by sheer force of affection, he was, perhaps, the most detached man of a generation in which men were dominated by the passion for causes, and by zeal for the betterment of their fellows. He had political convictions, and was not only a party man, but an office-holder; but no turn of his party's fortunes ever really touched him, and the absorbing movements of his time awoke no response in his heart. He loved a little group with beautiful tenderness; the rest of mankind he studied. There was a vein of something rich in his imagination, but in his moments of freest expression his style never passed certain limits of reserve, never quite realized the splendor which seemed at times on the very point of spreading the hue of moving passion over his closely packed and subtly phrased sentences. The reticence of his nature was so instinctive, and became so much a part of him, that it held his writing back from that last stage of abandon, of unconscious revelation, which other masters of style reach in their happiest moments. One cannot escape the feeling that the acute New England self-consciousness laid its spell on Hawthorne, as on all the other writers of his section, and that he

was never quite free from the haunting fear that he should reveal more than he intended; which is precisely what the greatest writers do, in those brief but glorious hours when they are transported out of themselves and lifted above themselves.

There is not only a touch of pallor on Hawthorne's work, but there is, at times, a suggestion of rusticity in his style; as if he had not quite gained the freedom of his craft. It is here that the provincialism of his early surroundings left its trace; in spite of the rare beauty and distinction of his diction, there appear in it from time to time traces of a world of high interests but of narrow artistic associations. The construction of the sentences is, as a rule, not only sound, but full of that kind of felicity which lies within the reach of the man of artistic genius only; but there are also traces of rigidity, the marks of his solitude and detachment and of his isolation from the vital currents of artistic feeling and habit. His style has at times the richness of texture of tapestry or of a rare brocade, but its lines are not always flowing, its folds not always free and perfectly expressive of that which they clothe. Great beauty he certainly has, but radiance was denied him.

One feels in him a curious absence of that element of youth which is the characteristic of all other American writers of his rank except Poe. The gift of youth seems to have been denied both these men of sensitive genius; in a world so new that all fortune seemed within the reach of audacity and energy, there was a touch of Old World tragedy on these children of a young civilization. From neither was the essential pathos of life hidden; neither was diverted or imposed upon by the brave new trappings, the novel and stimulating surroundings, of the old races on the new continent. Both seemed to look through the glamour of immense material possessions to the ancient soul of man, always facing the same fate, always under the shadow of the same failures, calamities, sins; and both sought in art to escape from the hardness and materialism of an immature civilization.

To Hawthorne, however, was given one resource which was denied to Poe: the resource of humor. His humor was not contagious like Irving's; it had none of the racy tang of the soil, like Lowell's; it was not quick-footed like Holmes's, in whose work it is continually losing its pervasiveness and gaining the concentration of wit. In Hawthorne, humor takes the form of a gentle brooding over the foibles and weaknesses of men; often sombre,

rarely saturnine; gaining a certain effectiveness from its lack of gayety. There is no overflow of buoyant spirits, no flooding of the inlets and recesses of thought and experience with the full, deep movement of a rich, powerful nature, charged with vitality and abounding in health; there is, rather, a quiet meditative contrast between the externalities and the realities of man's fortunes in this world; the play of a keenly observant, detached and reflective mind over the surface of life. Hawthorne's humor is full of thought; it never carries him out of himself; it never loses the sense of proportion and relation; it is keen, penetrating, searching, full of intelligence. It is so dispassionate and impersonal that it seems at times slightly touched with malice.

The chapter on "The Custom-House," which serves as a preface to "The Scarlet Letter," is an example of the cool, deliberate play of his humor; of its keen and, at times, caustic quality. It is probable that he was not wholly aware of the keenness of his pen, and that the local storm which broke about him when that report of a provincial town appeared, was like a bolt out of a clear sky. If his humor shows at times a sharp edge it does not provoke laughter, any more than his pathos brings tears.

His genius was extraordinarily sensitive, but it was not lacking in virility and energy. Isolation brought out the lines of his individuality, and not only compelled him to use the material which was most vitally related to his imagination, and therefore most completely possessed by it, but to create his own methods and form his own style. He shows almost no trace of the influence of other writers; in art, as in life, he stood aloof from his time. The vitality of his genius is shown by the fulness of its expression under such adverse conditions; his distinction is heightened by the fact that it was not gained by free intercourse with the masters of his craft. His art is the more wonderful because he was so entirely self-instructed. He is our foremost man of letters by virtue of a distinction which, though self-achieved, is of the finest and highest. He is the most perfect artist in our literature, not only by reason of the temperament, insight, sense of form and resource of expression which he put into his work, but because his rare and beautiful achievements were made in air so chilling to such aims as his, and in an age in which he was an alien by the very quality of his genius.

HAMILTON WRIGHT MABIE.

THE ENGLISH IN TIBET: A RUSSIAN VIEW.

BY PRINCE ESPER OUKHTOMSKY.

We Russians are late! The English are ready to stretch forth the hand of power to the realm of the Dalai-Lama. At the present moment, there can be no doubt that the Calcutta authorities will soon have entered into close relations with the majority of Trans-Himalayan rulers, will open for themselves a free trade route to Lhasa, and beyond to interior China, and will forthwith change the entire character of Central-Asian politics. As a rule, Russians are completely ignorant of this region; and the Russian press gives voice to the most astonishing opinions regarding Tibet in general, the Dalai-Lama and such subjects; and, in consequence, somewhat confused and cloudy views have been entertained in Russia regarding the true position of things in the centres of the Lamaist East, not the least singular of these being the baseless illusion that the Russians are there playing the rôle of pioneers of civilization, and that new, easily gained and brilliant results await them there.

Unfortunately, this is far from being the case, and every one who is familiar with the historic process by which Western travellers have become acquainted with Tibet, must confess that the knowledge possessed by Russians and the vagueness of their aims seem rather pitiful by comparison. Among the subjects of the Russian Empire there have been included for more than two centuries several hundred thousand Lamaists, spiritually united to the millions of their co-religionists within the bounds of the Chinese Empire, and yet Russians have long entirely ignored the results obtained by European explorations of Tibet.

As early as 1816, the English planted their Resident in Khatmandu, the capital of Nepal. The Orientalist, Bryan Hodgson, gained undying glory by his observations of commercial condi-

tions in Central Asia, and his study of local life and religion through intercourse with the natives; he was the first to discover among the Himalayans the literary monuments of Buddhism in the Sanskrit language, copies of which he supplied to the learned societies of London and Paris. Entering into correspondence with the Dalai-Lama, the English Resident received from him the books and papers left by a former Capuchin Mission, as well as a full collection of the most sacred Tibetan writings.

Wishing to gain a firm foothold near the religious centres of Tibet, the British Government, shortly after 1830, decided to build an important outpost at Darjeeling, in the territory of the weak Sikkim Raja, which was considered to be only a few days' journey from Teshu-Lumpo. In 1835 this place was ceded to the English, who undertook to pay a certain fixed amount yearly for it. Dr. Campbell was instructed to take measures for the development of Darjeeling. From 1840 to 1862 he watched over this district, which was important from a sanitary, commercial and political point of view alike. A variegated population streamed thither from the hills; thousands of people settled there. Tea gardens were planted; a market for the Trans-Himalayan tribes was opened. The English had already gained control of the people of Sikkim at a favorable juncture, and had bought them over to their interests. The importance of Darjeeling was immensely increased when the railroad uniting it with Calcutta was built. Little by little, the Europeans became acquainted with the character of the borderland between India and Tibet. Engineers made and maintained a good road to the mountains, and noted the Jelap-la Pass, which leads to the Chumba Valley, as the most convenient road. By a treaty with the Raja, the Calcutta Government has the right to expel from Sikkim all disaffected inhabitants. The native prince has already visited Darjeeling to become acquainted with European habits.

Every day the walls of conservatism and the artificial barrier of exclusion were undermined and became ready to fall. The Tibetans were undecided, awaiting the future with uncertainty, not unwilling to be rid of the Chinese, and at the same time regarding the decisive action of the English with the utmost apprehension. Some of them, especially the Lamas, visited Calcutta, which is only a day's journey from Darjeeling, the fare by rail being only seven rupees (about two dollars). Caravans of

merchants passing through Tibet from Nepal scatter as many Indian newspapers as possible. As the populace is pre-eminently commercial, the subjects of the Dalai-Lama and Banchen-Bogdo are greatly disposed to favor the further extension of commercial relations. The Chinese are no longer able to sell their products in Tibet, because the natives themselves go west for them, finding this much more profitable. Every autumn more than a thousand Tibetans visit Calcutta for this purpose, and stay there for weeks at a time. The road from India to Lhasa through Nepal is twice as long and twice as difficult as the way over the Jelap-la Pass. From Sikkim caravans take a week to reach Teshu-Lumpo and arrive thence at the capital in an even shorter time.

The English, owing to the considerable import duties imposed by Russia, no longer find as good a market as before for Indian teas in western Turkestan. Russian merchandise competes quite successfully with British goods in Kashgar. Investigations carried on by Carey regarding the possibility of sending goods from India to the localities to the east of Yarkand, met with a negative result. The deserts there are so inhospitable that no cultivation is practicable. There remains the best and shortest road through the Chumba Valley from Darjeeling. Trade by that route is already of some importance and promises to grow to considerable proportions. It is not for nothing that in Teshu-Lumpo and Lhasa are gathered so many threads uniting the Lamaists of Russia, Mongolia and the mountain regions with their chief religious centres. The most indispensable and expensive import from China is brick tea. It costs so much that, although it is used in great quantities, it is out of the reach of the common people. This exactly suits the English. The planters of Assam and Darjeeling think that, by saving up the leavings and fragments of their tea, they can provide exactly what the Tibetans require and at a low price, which at once undersells the Chinese product and makes it possible for all the natives to secure the favorite delicacy of Central Asia. There is also a great demand for Indian rice, which will likewise be much cheaper than Chinese, for tobacco, for the most varied European productions and for precious stones. Tibet in its turn pays with its natural treasures, gold, silver and other metals, of which there is still an abundance in the country; rock-salt, pure musk, very cheap cattle and extremely valuable wool, medicinal herbs and so forth. As soon as relations are estab-

lished, the natives and the English will rapidly understand in what ways they can be profitable and agreeable to each other. Ultimately, of course, the newcomers from the West, from being friends on an equal footing will turn into masters, and with iron will compel acquiescence to their every wish.

The British Government is not advancing into Tibet alone. The British missionaries are acting in perfect accord with it. While Russia does not accomplish what might be wished, even in the outlying parts where Russian blood is mixed with the native races, the West has sent its pioneers of Christian culture into the heart of Asia. The Moravian Brothers who formerly lived in Tsaritzin seeking to convert the Kalmucks, and whom the Russians expelled, have found a warm welcome in India, settling in the Himalayas; they have not only penetrated Lamaism, but have perfectly mastered the Tibetan language. The Calcutta Government has taken advantage of this to publish an excellent dictionary and grammar, compiled by Jaeschke, one of the missionaries. The Holy Scriptures in the Mongolian language are likewise distributed by the English amongst the nomads. The natives who are free from fanaticism willingly buy them. Not long ago, a zealous worker along these lines, Gilmore by name, traversed the Buddhist steppe to the region beyond Lake Baikal, to build a monument to certain English missionaries who had worked for thirty years amongst the Buriats. The Belgian propagandists are allowed to attempt to establish the influence of the Vatican in Mongolia. Catholic missionaries are directing their efforts towards Tibet from two sides, and have already had martyrs in this sufficiently thankless task. They come first from the eastern frontier, through China, and secondly from Sikkim.

In the wilderness, the Catholic missionaries work exactly as did the ever-memorable apostle of Siberia, the Metropolitan Innocent: they occupy themselves with the civilization of the natives, bring the surrounding regions into a flourishing condition and enter into friendly relations with the pagans. Understanding that Buddhism is a religion of the thoughtful, not of the ignorant, and consequently contains absolutely no democratic elements, the preachers from the West buy slaves, gather round them the downtrodden and educate children. From the moment when the pagans see the principles of the New Testament put into practice (so far as this is possible for fallible mortals), a reverence

for the pioneers of Christian civilization must grow and increase. Though the missionaries regard Lamaism with certain easily understood prejudices, and have even suffered some persecution, yet they ultimately come to respect the religious toleration of the Buddhist priesthood and the kindness of the simple monks and "twice born," and they have more than once been indebted to their rivals, the Lamas, for assistance.

It is important to notice that England has always come to the help of the missionaries in Tibet. When they have been oppressed, word has found its way to Calcutta through the Nepalese. In Teshu-Lumpo and Lhasa the people are greatly afraid of the natives of Nepal, and are willing to pay dearly to avoid a contest of arms with the terrible Goorkas. The English have long understood this peculiarity, and artfully take advantage of it.

They have sent Hindoos to interior Asia to explore, paying them well for their information. Russia has far larger numbers of people adapted for relations with Tibet, and even now many Buriats live there without breaking their relations with their native land (in Russian Siberia). But Russia has been indifferent to all this. For two centuries our native races have had an opportunity of proving themselves excellent and faithful subjects. Among them are found many, to a large extent Russianized, who are fully qualified and well suited to represent us. Is it not time for Russia at last to take advantage of this circumstance? Is it possible that the first educated Russian traveller will reach Lhasa through Darjeeling, under the protection and by the permission of the English Government?

What is the chief danger of the movement of the English armies to "the land of the Lamas"? The Tibetan monasteries are exceedingly rich, and form real treasure-houses of ancient culture; they contain religious objects of the highest artistic value, and the rarest literary memorials. If the Sepoys reach Teshu-Lumpo and Lhasa, with their fanatical passion for loot, which was so signally exhibited in the recent Boxer campaign, it is beyond all doubt that the most precious treasures on the altars and in the libraries of the Lamas will be in danger. It is impossible even to tell approximately how great an injury may thus be caused to Orientalism, how the solution of many scientific problems may be put off, problems which are closely bound up with the gradual revelation of the secrets of Tibet. The vandalism which was a

disgrace to our age, when Pekin was recently ransacked and looted, will pale before what the English will probably do by the hands of their dusky mercenaries. The temptation will be too great. Only zealous students of this particular department of knowledge could save everything which is rare and worthy of special attention.

Therefore, we face the critical moment, when the best monuments, the last fragments, of ancient Buddhist creative genius are in danger of falling into the gulf of oblivion. What even the hordes of Genghis Khan guarded and reverently preserved will be trampled under foot by the invading "*Pax Britannica.*" Russia has been too late, with her obscurely felt inclination to enter into closer relations with the realm of the Dalai-Lama. Russia, which had every reason to be the first in this field, thanks to its Buddhist Buriats and Kalmucks, thanks to its students of Mongolia and its Central-Asian travellers; Russia, which possesses such well-known students of Buddhism as Oldenburg, such world-famous ethnographists as Clements, will now receive from the hands of strangers the most important facts concerning Tibet, which is bound to Russia by so many ties. But there remains the distant hope that the free spirit of the great Reincarnating Lamas will, under pressure of the political domination of England, sooner or later take a new direction, seeking for itself a fit terrestrial embodiment, and that some fine day we shall see the Dalai-Lama and the Banchen-Bogdo reincarnated within the sphere of Russian influence. England may gain territorial control of the Lamaist world, but to win it spiritually and to bring it closer to them will be given only to those who will not raise a destroying hand against the shrines of Buddhism.

ESPER OUKHTOMSKY.

WHY WOMEN CANNOT VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY IDA HUSTED HARPER.

WHY is it that in the United States, the leading republic of the world, the land whose proudest boast is the equal rights of all its citizens, one-half of its citizens are denied all voice in its government? What is the reason that this nation, in which women have more privileges and greater liberty than in any other, refuses them the franchise, which is guarantee and protector of rights? These are the questions continually addressed to American women by those of other countries, who, although not enjoying a tithe of our freedom in general, nevertheless possess some form of suffrage.

The amazing answer must be made that, while most of the monarchies grant to certain classes of women some electoral rights, no republic permits its women citizens to vote. This anomaly exists, however, only because the monarchy loves property more, and not because it despises women less. In other words, it is the property and not the individual that votes, and the fact that it is a woman who pays the taxes or the rent does not deprive the property of its representation. But when men form a republic, they rise to noble heights, and decree, in their lofty virtue, that man and not property shall be represented at the ballot-box, and the reason why woman cannot get there is because she comes under the head of "property."

To a proud-spirited, justice-loving American woman the humiliation of her disfranchisement is too keen to be put into words. It touches with mildew the pride she feels in the many splendid institutions of her country, and it flavors with bitterness the joy she experiences in her ever-increasing opportunities and independence. A Government founded upon individual representa-

tion, and yet refusing this absolutely to one-half the people, presents a satire at which the whole world must smile in scorn. This action is still more surprising when one considers that this excluded half possesses the very qualities in which the present electorate is sadly deficient, and for the need of which the country sorely suffers. The mystery deepens still more when one observes that to these rejected members of the body politic are given the highest educational advantages at the expense of the state, admission to all avenues of business, and extensive legal and civil rights. In other words, they are carefully prepared for the highest citizenship, and then forbidden to participate in affairs of state. Paradox of paradoxes!

The solution of this strange problem may be discovered in two words—Constitutional Law! There are forty-two strong reasons why women cannot vote in the United States. The first and greatest lies in the National Constitution, the other forty-one are found in the Constitutions of the different States. In these revered documents one little word of four letters, "male," is all that stands between 15,000,000 women and the suffrage.

Our forefathers came to American shores for the especial purpose of securing religious liberty, but their first move in establishing their local government was to provide that no one should have any voice in it who was not a member of the church, and no one could be a member of the church whose conduct and religious belief did not agree exactly with those of the Puritan Fathers. As the years passed by, the religious test was relaxed sufficiently to admit into the voting body certain members of the community known as "free men," through permission of those who already formed this electorate, but a property qualification was imposed which still barred out the vast majority of men. At the time when our present National Constitution was adopted, it is estimated that in Massachusetts not four per cent., and in Connecticut not two per cent., of the male inhabitants were qualified to vote. Thus carefully guarded was the governing power.

After the War of the Revolution had freed the colonies from the control of Great Britain, it soon became evident that some stronger compact of federal union was necessary than the Articles of Confederation which had been at first adopted. The result of four years of careful thought and effort on the part of the great leaders in this new government was our present Constitution. So

perfectly adapted was this remarkable document to the needs of a republic that, in one hundred years, the only changes found necessary were those embodied in the three amendments adopted after the Civil War had greatly changed the character of the Government.

In studying the early history of the attempt at a republican form of government, one must be impressed by the extreme jealousy felt by the different States lest the centralized power which it was proposed to vest in a Congress should take away from them some of their own cherished sovereignty. Therefore the framers of the Constitution had to recognize at every point this unyielding principle of State's Rights, and exercise the greatest care that nothing in the American Magna Charta should infringe upon its jurisdiction. Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, and in a large measure of this National Constitution, said of the latter in 1816:

> "The infancy of the subject at that moment, and our inexperience of self-government, caused gross departures in that draft from genuine republican canons. In truth, the abuses of monarchy had so much filled all the space of political contemplation that we imagined everything republican which was not monarchy."

The one point on which the States insisted most strenuously was the right to fix the qualifications for the suffrage, thus showing conclusively that they regarded it as the source of power. In response to this demand, the Constitution left this right absolutely to the States. The States, thus left unhampered, formed their own Constitutions. Some of these made the owning of property necessary for a vote; others provided an educational test; most of them required the voter to be white; and all, with one exception (New Jersey), declared that only male citizens should have the franchise. In order to rivet its Constitution still more firmly, each State provided that to alter it in the smallest particular the Legislature must submit the question to the voters and a majority of them must consent to it. In three decades the spirit of democracy had grown so strong that the property qualification was practically abolished, and by 1820 the great body of wage-earners were admitted to the electorate. As new States came into the Union with a sparse population and anxious for a large number of voters, they omitted from their Constitutions both the property

and the educational requirements, and in the few States where these now exist they are so slight as to be easily met.

At the close of the Civil War, the Republican party, which was in almost complete control of the country, decided that the great body of negro men who had been freed from slavery must have the franchise, partly as a means of protection for themselves, and partly because they could be depended on to vote solidly the Republican ticket. To accomplish this the Legislature of one State after another submitted to the voters an amendment to its Constitution to strike out the word "white" from the suffrage clause, but it was defeated in every instance. So strong, however, was the determination that the Congress of the United States decided to amend the National Constitution for the purpose. This could be done by a majority of two-thirds of the members submitting the amendment to a vote of the various State Legislatures. After two years, the requisite three-fourths majority of these were secured, and the Fourteenth Amendment was declared adopted in 1868. This did not prove sufficient to secure the ballot for the negro man, and the next year the Congress submitted the more drastic Fifteenth Amendment to the Legislatures, and it was declared adopted in 1870.

Thus the religious, the property, the educational and the color qualifications have been swept away; but, in the Constitutions of all the States except four, the word "male" still remains in the suffrage clause, absolutely prohibiting to all women a voice in the government. Such is the situation to-day in a country which poses before the world as the greatest and most perfect republic that ever existed; which exults over all the nations of the earth as the only land of equal rights; which declares that its foundation, its corner-stone, the keystone of its arch, is individual representation! The irony of it! The injustice, the tyranny, the disgrace of it! In no monarchy is there such arbitrary discrimination against one-half the people. There is not another country having an elected representative body, where this body itself may not extend the suffrage. Australia, by an Act of its Parliament, enfranchised 850,000 women. The Parliament of New Zealand, by a single Act, conferred the suffrage on 150,000. The Parliament of Great Britain has absolute power to grant the franchise to its millions of women. This is true of all the legislative bodies on the Continent of Europe. But the Government of the United

States, in its overpowering desire to vest all authority in the people themselves, has placed one half of the people in complete and helpless subjection to the other half.

It is not surprising that, at the inception of this republic, women were ignored. Their life in those early days was purely domestic, and household duties were so numerous and complicated as to leave neither time nor strength for outside interests. They received only the rudiments of education; they never had attempted organization for any purpose; they had no part in the industrial life of the nation beyond the home; and married women could not hold property or transact business. Therefore, it was but natural, in this experiment of a government by the people, when there was widespread distrust even as to the wisdom and stability of man suffrage, that the untried and unknown element represented by women should have been wholly disregarded. But a century and a quarter have passed since the courageous attempt at a representative government, and in its unprecedented development and progress women have kept even pace. Their status has been revolutionized, until, educationally, legally and industrially, it approximates that of men. The high-schools educate boys and girls together with no discriminations, and in 1902 the girls in attendance formed over 57½ per cent. of the whole number; while in every State the girl graduates far exceeded the boys, the total figures being 23,786 boys, 42,476 girls. In the public schools, there are nearly three times as many women as men teachers. In 1902, there were in the high, normal and advanced manual-training schools 347,109 male, 463,121 female students. There are at present over 32,000 women enrolled in the universities, colleges and professional schools (omitting nurses' and business schools); and at least three-fourths of these are in coeducational institutions, being educated along precisely the same lines as men. Excluding Catholic institutions, over eighty per cent. of the universities and colleges are coeducational. From 1890 to 1900, their percentage of increase stood—men, 78 per cent., women, 105.4. In 1902, women formed one-third of the whole number of college students, and they received nearly one-half of all the degrees which were conferred during the year. These brief statistics indicate the present educational position of women in the United States.

A glance at the laws will show that the invidious distinctions of

early days have been very largely eradicated. In three-fourths of the States, a married woman now may own and control her separate property, and in all of them she may dispose of it by will, the same as a married man. In two-thirds of them, her earnings are absolutely under her own control. In almost all of them, she may make contracts and bring suit in the courts. The old laws of inheritance have been so changed that in very few States is a widow left in the helpless condition of former days. Nine of them give to the mother equal guardianship and control of the children. The sentiment of judges and juries is so strongly in favor of women, that attorneys for men who are plaintiffs or defendants against women in civil or criminal cases declare they cannot get justice for their clients. To say that the laws are in all respects as fair to women as to men would be too sweeping, but it may be justly claimed that they are more nearly so in the United States than in any other country.

A few States prohibit women from mining, a few from selling intoxicating liquors, a few from practising law, but the statement may be made that, in general, no occupation is forbidden to them. Thousands of women are physicians, ministers, lawyers, university professors, dentists and pharmacists—431,153 in the professions according to the census of 1900. They are presidents of banks and various corporations, at the head of large manufactories, owners and managers of immense ranches, editors of influential magazines and newspapers, presidents of colleges—everywhere engaged in business of all kinds with the full approval of law and public sentiment. It has been estimated that one-tenth of our many millionaires are women. They pay taxes on billions of dollars' worth of property. There are many villages and small cities where one-third of the taxpayers are women. The benefactions of women for educational, religious and charitable purposes amount to millions. Philanthropic and reform work has very largely passed into their hands. They constitute three-fourths of the church membership; and without their service and devotion the various denominations could not exist. The organizations of women have reached almost inconceivable proportions. Over one hundred of these are national in their scope, and they have a membership of not less than 4,000,000. The transference of the principal part of the home industries to the factory has given women a leisure unknown to their foremothers, and left them

free to direct their energies into new channels. To describe adequately their influence on social and personal life would be a difficult undertaking, for it is everywhere supreme.

No other nation on the globe has accorded to women such opportunities, such liberty and such independence as they enjoy in the United States. How utterly incomprehensible to other countries, therefore, must seem their despotic exclusion from all direct part in the affairs of government. The explanation has been given; it lies in the one stubborn fact that, at every move in this direction, American women strike that Rock of Gibraltar—the Constitution! If they had only to carry their case to the Congress, they might hope eventually to secure justice from that body and obtain their enfranchisement, but Congress has power merely to submit to the State Legislatures a proposed amendment to the National Constitution. For thirty-five years, the ablest women in the nation, headed by those great pioneers, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, and supported by hundreds of thousands of petitions, have gone before Congressional Committees with arguments that never have been excelled by members of House or Senate, asking only that the question might be sent to the State Legislatures for settlement. And yet, never but once in all these years has the subject even been permitted to come up on the floor of Congress for debate. An almost universal sentiment exists against making another amendment to the National Constitution. Therefore, the Congress shifts the responsibility and sends the petitioners to the States.

When the women turn to the States, what do they discover? Still another impregnable fortress, "The Constitution." Not one State Legislature has authority to confer the suffrage. All it can do is to submit the question to the voters. Having exhausted every expedient, where do the women find themselves at last? Face to face with such an electorate as does not exist anywhere else in the world. American women, descendants of Revolutionary ancestors who died to create this Government, must beg for the right to represent themselves from thousands of negroes, but one generation removed from slavery; from thousands of immigrants fresh from the slums of the Old World, many of them only six months in the United States and unable to speak a word of English; from thousands of the ignorant, drunken, immoral and criminal men who inhabit the lowest quarters of our own cities;

from thousands of unprincipled and corrupt political "bosses." These are the electors before whom we must plead our cause in every State, and only by their consent can we have that suffrage through whose possession they have been made our rulers.

If the opposition rested with these classes alone we still might hope for political freedom; but there are forces far stronger than these which are immovably opposed to giving woman any power in government. The two dominating influences in politics to-day are the corporations, or "trusts," and the liquor interest, the latter indeed constituting one of the greatest of "trusts." The Government finds in it an inexhaustible source of revenue. It controls millions of votes. There are few members of the Congress or the State Legislatures who do not owe their election in a greater or less degree to its influence, or whom it could not defeat. No village is so small as not to feel its touch on local affairs. It is grounded in politics, and to it and its collateral branches, the gambling resort and the house of ill repute, woman is believed to be an implacable foe. Therefore, it decrees that she shall not be a political factor. The hand of the great moneyed corporations is on the lever of the party "machines." They can calculate to a nicety how many voters must be bought, how many candidates must be "fixed," how many officials must be owned. The entrance of woman into the field would upset all calculations, add to the expenses if she were corruptible, and spoil the plans if she were not. They will have none of her.

The party "bosses" are unchangeably hostile to women as voters. They can now put up candidates objectionable as to character but sound on the party issues, and force the male electors to vote the straight ticket. They have learned in the few States where women have the suffrage that women will not obey the party whip, and so the word has been passed to other States to bar women out. No dominant political party can see any advantage to itself in the enfranchisement of women, as the Democrats did when they granted the ballot to working-men and the Republicans when they gave it to negro men, and so neither will make it an issue. The aristocracy observe the large families of the laboring classes and fear to give them any more political power. The church, which might reasonably expect increased influence in public affairs through the enfranchisement of women, is not sure that it would be in accordance with the divine will. A very con-

siderable opposition is found also among those who are growing sceptical as to the value of a democracy, who are in despair at the mass of conglomerate elements which now make up the electorate, and believe there should be a limit instead of an increase. A most peculiar obstacle is found, too, in the apathy of women themselves, and this, paradoxical as it may seem, is partly because so much has been gained for them already. They have now so many rights, they enjoy so great a degree of freedom and they are so absorbed in their various pursuits that they do not make the investigation necessary to show the larger advantages to themselves and to the community which would result from their possession of the suffrage. But their indifference is seized upon by the men of their acquaintance as a pretext for withholding their own support from the measure.

Such, in the barest outline, is the situation which has confronted the advocates of woman suffrage in the fifteen trials they have made to amend the State Constitutions through the votes of the electors. Again we ask, "Is it strange that the women of the United States cannot get the franchise?" Could they have obtained any one of the privileges they now enjoy if it had been necessary to secure the consent of a majority of the men in each State, white and black, native and foreign, educated and ignorant, good and bad; or if the moneyed or political organizations had believed it would be detrimental to their interests? But all that was necessary for every other progressive step was the changing of a statute law by the Legislature, the favorable decision of a board of trustees, the willingness of an employer to make an experiment; while by far the greatest number of innovations were made possible by a general spirit of independence and personal freedom and a constantly progressing public sentiment. It is only when women ask for a voice in the government that they come into contact with the impassable wall of Constitutional Law.

Is the situation, then, hopeless; and must the women of this republic forever remain disfranchised and politically discredited? Not by any means. Though opposed by such obstacles as never have been placed in the way of any other class of citizens, the leaders of the movement to obtain the suffrage for women have not a doubt of its ultimate success, and they have strong reasons for the faith that is in them. When equal rights for women, of which the franchise was only one, were first demanded a little

over half a century ago, the demands were met with hostility and derision; and yet those who made them lived to see every one conceded except that for the suffrage; and this they saw granted in full in four States by mandate of the voters, and in part in twenty-six others by legislative enactment, which may confer a local and limited franchise. Wyoming had woman suffrage for twenty-one years as a Territory, and no power was strong enough to keep it out of the Constitution for Statehood when it was formed in 1890. Utah, after seventeen years' experience of it, placed it in the Statehood Constitution in 1895 by a majority of 26,000 in a vote of a little over 31,000. Colorado rejected a woman-suffrage amendment in 1877, but by 1893 there had been a change of public sentiment sufficient to carry it by a majority of 6,347. In Idaho, in 1896, all political parties united in endorsing an amendment, which was adopted by a majority of 5,844 in a vote of 18,408. Five States have twice submitted a woman-suffrage amendment. In Colorado it was carried the second time; in Kansas the percentage of opposition was greatly lessened; in Oregon the affirmative vote was increased from 11,223 to 26,265, and the measure was lost by only 2,137. In South Dakota, in 1890, the amendment received an affirmative of thirty-five per cent. of the whole vote cast upon it, and in 1898 it received forty-seven per cent. The first vote was taken in Washington in 1889, and in 1898 the opposing majority had been reduced about one-half.

These figures justify the belief that the question can be carried in all these States the next time it is submitted. They also offer mathematical proof of the favorable change which is taking place in public opinion. The general attitude toward the movement has advanced from one of ridicule to one of respect, and even the politicians avoid the question rather than fight it. The ancient and stereotyped objections are seldom heard. The chairman of the National Suffrage Press Bureau last year secured the publication of about 75,000 favorable articles, simply by sending them to the newspapers. The membership of the National Association has doubled within a few years, and its receipts have increased from $2,000 to $20,000 a year, with a reserve fund at present in the treasury of $28,000. The large organizations of women, almost without exception, are engaged in various kinds of civic work which inevitably carry them to the City Councils and State Legislatures for necessary assistance, and there they learn the

bitter lesson that the members of these bodies recognize no obligations except to their constituents, those who put them in office and can put them out. This experience is constantly transforming women into ardent advocates of suffrage.

There is among men a growing sentiment of justice toward women, who are bravely bearing their share of the burdens of citizenship, paying their full proportion of taxes, striving earnestly to better conditions, taking an interest in public questions, engaging in all kinds of business, in every way proving themselves valuable factors in the community. Men are beginning to realize the gross injustice of denying such women a voice in municipal and State affairs, in the election of those who make and administer the laws and who are largely responsible for the welfare of the people. This feeling is becoming especially strong among the men of the wage-earning classes. The women of their families have been sent by economic conditions into a field of labor outside the home, and there, denied the political influence which is the protection of the working-men, they are at an immense disadvantage, and so of late years the great labor organizations are demanding the ballot for women.

Thoughtful and patriotic men in all parts of the country, who, because of the discouraging political conditions which everywhere exist, have had their belief in a democratic government shaken, are struggling into a consciousness that the United States is not and never has been a democracy. They are awakening to the fact that into the electorate, which is in reality the Government, have been poured the worst elements — ignorance, intemperance, immorality, dishonesty, crime of every nature; that each addition which has been made to it has contained a larger proportion of these elements than of those which might have purified and elevated it. A true democracy, a genuine republic, must be founded upon a representation of the whole people. If, during all these years, one-half of the men and one-half of the women had participated in national affairs, we might then have approximated an example of representative government; but, having admitted only men and excluded women, with all that women stand for in morality, temperance, religion, conscientiousness, love of home, spirituality and exalted ideals, we are utterly without data upon which to base conclusions. The real republic, therefore, is still in the future; the experiment is yet to be made.

To sum up the situation: We have in the United States a Government based on universal male suffrage. At every election, all the material interests are fully represented, but the vast proportion of the spiritual influences have no direct expression. The result is a material development unsurpassed in the world's history, and a moral retrogression in public life before which the people stand appalled. The time is not far distant—the murmur of its approach is making itself heard as the national elections draw near—when the honesty and integrity of the nation will rise in protest and revolt. Not since the days of the Civil War has there been a great moral question at stake; all the issues have been material—tariff, currency, foreign policy, extension of territory—all of a character which men felt entirely competent to decide without help from women. But eventually this modern mercenary spirit will reach its limit, and in the reaction, moral issues will arise on whose decision the very future of the Government itself will depend. It is then that the best men of the nation will eagerly welcome the assistance of women, will grasp it, indeed, as the only means of salvation.

These are chief of the reasons why we women of the United States have hope and faith that ultimately we shall receive the right of suffrage which morally belongs to us under a free Government. We know that the day is drawing near when all the influences which have so long prevailed against us, combining their forces, will not be strong enough to overcome that sterling sense of justice and fair play which has secured to us the many rights we now enjoy. And while we must wait, we are striving by every means at our command to prepare ourselves and our countrywomen for a wise and effective use of that authority when it shall come into our possession.

IDA HUSTED HARPER.

THE LABOR PROBLEM ON THE PANAMA CANAL.

BY BRIGADIER-GENERAL PETER C. HAINS, U.S.A.

It is reversing the usual order of things to discuss the method of executing a great engineering work before all the details of the project are definitely settled. At the same time, where it is practically certain that the project can be forecasted within certain narrow limits, this may be done to advantage. The route of the canal is fixed by law, and the work already done by the Panama Canal Companies must be utilized. The plan, therefore, in a general way, follows as a logical result; the details alone are subject to modification. As the method of constructing will not be affected by minor modifications in the project, discussion of the labor problem will not only be of interest but cannot fail to be of advantage.

The law requires that the canal "shall be of sufficient capacity and depth as shall afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draught now in use and such as may be reasonably anticipated." But who can tell what may be reasonably anticipated? Judging the future by the past, we may anticipate ships to be 1,000 feet long and 100 feet beam inside of 50 years. The Isthmian Canal Commission fixed upon 740 feet for the length of the locks, yet the ink with which the members penned their signatures to its report was scarcely dry before it was reported that the Cunard Line was about to begin the construction of one or more ships that would be too long to go through them.

It is not my present purpose, however, to discuss the plans of the canal. The problem of sanitary control is of most immediate importance, and steps have already been taken looking to its solution. There is one matter connected with it, on which there has been a good deal of thoughtless speculation—that is, in regard

to the number of laborers to be provided for. We frequently hear it stated that 40,000 to 50,000 laborers will be required on the Isthmus. This seems to be an overestimate.

It is not difficult to estimate approximately the number of laborers that will be required under proper management, and it is assumed that there will be proper management. It would embarrass operations to have a greater number of people there than can find profitable employment. The work of digging the canal is not going to be done by an army of laborers, equipped with spades and shovels, but by machinery, operated on modern methods by steam or electric power. A large number of workmen, skilled and unskilled, will be required even under these conditions; but it is not probable that the number will ever reach anything like 40,000.

Nearly all the excavation between the Atlantic Ocean and the Bohio Dam, a distance of fifteen miles, most of that between Bohio and Bas Obispo, a distance of twelve miles, and nearly all that between Pedro Miguel locks and the Pacific Ocean, a distance of eight miles, will be done with dredges, and comparatively few men will be needed. In other words, of the total 47 miles of the canal, about 35 of it will be excavated chiefly with dredges, requiring but few laborers. The Culebra Cut, located between Bas Obispo and Pedro Miguel, is heavy work and is the feature which will determine the time of completing the canal. It is impossible to employ more than a certain amount of machinery on this Cut to advantage, and that fact will limit the number of employees. The other works, such as the Bohio Dam, the locks and the spillway, need not be hurried, as their early completion would not affect the time of opening the canal to navigation. The work on the Great Cut should be pushed energetically; but, unfortunately, the conditions are such that rapid progress cannot be made there.

The Chicago Drainage Canal is 34 miles long, while the Panama Canal is 47. The maximum number of employees on the former at any one time was about 8,000. It is not probable that the ratio of number of employees to length of canal at Panama will ever exceed that at Chicago. It is more probable that it will be less, because of the proportionately larger amount of work that can be done with dredges. The Canal Company has now about 700 men, who remove less than 700,000 cubic yards a year, but their appliances are not well adapted to the work. The Isthmian Canal Commission called attention to this fact, and, in estimating

the value of plant, attached no value whatever to that now in use there, because it is out of date. It will be better to throw the present plant away and procure new machinery. With modern appliances and the same number of men, the output ought to be more than doubled. At the present time, the output amounts to less than four cubic yards per day per man—a small amount, considering the character of the material and the part of the cut from which it is taken. With good machinery, there ought to be no difficulty in excavating ten cubic yards per day per man. At that rate, the employment of 2,000 men on the Culebra Cut would effect an output of about 6,000,000 cubic yards per year, which would complete the cut in about seven years. It is not probable, therefore, that more than 3,000 men will be employed at any one time on the Great Cut.

The greatest number ever employed at any one time on the Poe Lock at Sault Sainte Marie, the largest lock ever built, was about 760, and that was only for a short period in 1893, when the masonry work was being pushed with the greatest energy. The average number of men employed on it during the seven years consumed in its construction, was not more than about 300. During the two years 1892 and 1893, when the greatest number were employed, the average for the working months, from May to December, inclusive, was only about 500 men. If we allow double that number on the locks at Bohio, Pedro Miguel and Miraflores, we would only have 3,000 men on lock construction; and, allowing 1,000 on dredging, 1,000 on the Bohio Dam, 1,000 on Alhajuela Dam, 1,000 on Gigantic Spillway and 1,000 for other work, we would have a total of 8,000. If this be increased by twenty-five per cent., the total number would be only 10,000. This would seem to be a liberal estimate.

Next to the determination of plans for the canal, the most important question is the method of doing the work and of securing labor. Should the work be done by contract, or should it be done by day's labor? If by contract, should it be let to a single firm or syndicate that could command sufficient capital to carry it through, or should it be let in a number of smaller contracts? These are questions of great importance, which have thus far received but scant consideration. Moreover, there is room for a wide divergence of opinion among engineers. Each method has its advantages and disadvantages.

There are some advantages in letting the work to a single firm or syndicate, rather than to a number of firms. That course would enable the Government to determine immediately just what the work ought to cost. The estimates heretofore made are approximate only, and actual cost will vary from these figures sometimes one way and sometimes the other. But, after a contract is made for the entire work, the cost will be definitely fixed.

To let the work to a single firm or syndicate would relieve the Commission of an immense amount of labor, at least it would seem so; but it is not easy to draw specifications for a great work like this, with so many possibilities of error, without greatly enhancing the cost. There are always matters connected with a large engineering work that are overlooked, and others that it may not be possible to specify with accuracy at the outset. Things crop up during the course of the work which could not be foreseen. It is possible to insert a blanket clause that will cover all such contingencies, but to do so would neither be fair to the contractor nor just to the United States, for it would throw all the risk of errors of judgment on the contractor, and a contractor cannot afford to take such risk without charging for it. If the contractor takes the risk, he must put up his price. If the Government takes the risk, it must take the chances for controversies and claims.

The old De Lesseps Company tried the contract plan, but it failed to give satisfaction. The prices were all high. If an engineer refused to accept work because he believed it did not come up to the specifications, the matter was referred to Paris and he was overruled. Similar results, to some extent, would follow under American management; conflicts of opinion between engineers and contractors are inevitable. If the engineer be overruled, as he often will be, and sometimes ought to be, he, as well as other engineers, will become timid, unwisely yielding to the contractor's claims. This will happen even when both the contractor and engineer are honest; if either or both are dishonest, a worse condition follows.

The more powerful the contractor, the greater the difficulty of enforcing a strict compliance with specifications. Contractors, as a rule, are not dishonest. There are contractors who would rather lose all than claim a single dishonest dollar, but they are human and self-interest distorts the vision in spite of all efforts to the contrary.

It is, therefore, better that the contractor be not too powerful. In other words, it would be better to let the work to a number of smaller contractors. If the work were located in the United States, this method would undoubtedly be chosen. Such was the method employed on the Chicago Drainage Canal, and it is the method usually adopted on enterprises involving many different kinds of work.

The letting of the work to a single firm will naturally tend to increase the cost. The construction of the canal calls for many classes of work requiring men especially skilled in each; so that, if a single firm had the contract, it would sublet these special classes. The subcontractor and the principal would each expect a profit, with the result that the Government would pay a profit to both.

Under either system of contracts, it will be difficult to maintain proper sanitary control. Contractors will go to the Isthmus to make money. They will procure the cheapest labor obtainable, without regard to other considerations. Every contractor who goes to the Isthmus will find it necessary to complete his work and get out as quickly as possible. The Panama Isthmus is not a health resort, and it will not become one after complete sanitary control is established.

It may be said that there is no reason why the Government should not enforce regulations to preserve the health of the community within the ten-mile zone, just as is done within the United States. That is true. But the conditions are different. Panama and Colon are not included in the zone that comes under the complete control of the United States; and, though the treaty gives the United States power to establish sanitary conditions in these cities, still the fact remains that they are Spanish-American cities with all that it implies. A heterogeneous crowd such as will be drawn to the Isthmus will be difficult to manage. They will bring with them the habits, the prejudices and the diseases peculiar to their native lands. Along with them will come a multitude of parasites of the lowest classes.

In view of the peculiar and unusual conditions at Panama, the best method for the Government to pursue is, to employ its own labor and purchase the machinery by contract. Many advantages would result from following this plan; the control of the Government over the labor and sanitary problems would be absolute,

while there would be no danger of contractor's claims being made at the termination of the work.

Perhaps it will be claimed that work done by labor employed by the Government costs more than similar work done by contract. This is sometimes the case, but not always. Much depends on the individual characteristics of the person directing the work, whether he be an employee of the contractor or of the Government. If he be an employee of a contractor and fails to conduct the work efficiently and economically, he loses his job; if he be an employee of the Government, he may be retained in service and sent elsewhere. But there ought to be no difficulty in the Government's securing the services of men who can direct work efficiently and economically; work is often done by the Government far more efficiently and economically by day's labor than by contract. The work on the canal is a new one. It will require new tools and new machinery. Contractors would have no advantage over the Government in securing good machinery. Could he secure labor at lower rates than the Government? It is believed that the reverse is true; that the United States can secure labor on the Isthmus at lower rates than any contractor or set of contractors. The cost of labor on the Isthmus within the last few years has been low; previously under the old Company it was high. But the work done by the New Company has been largely for the purpose of keeping the concession alive and determining the character of the problems to be solved.

The lowest estimate of the time required to complete the canal is about eight years; but bad management, a war between the United States and some naval Power, an epidemic of yellow fever, a temporary change in the sentiment of the people of the United States toward the project, would cause delay that might postpone completion for years. Under such circumstances, a contractor might have a valid claim against the Government, the amount of which cannot be estimated. If the work be done by the Government, some loss and delay might ensue, but the loss would be of such a nature that only Government interests would suffer and the delay would cause no special embarrassment.

Captain F. A. Abbott, of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., in his Annual Report for 1896, made the following statement in regard to the work on the improvement of the Santee River:

"The total excavations on both canals up to June 30, 1892, amounted to 221,450 cubic yards, measured *in situ*, and had been done by contract, except 1,169 cubic yards. Dividing the total expenditures to June 30, 1892, for all purposes, by the above number of cubic yards excavated, shows the average cost of dredging here by contract to have been 51 cents per cubic yard, measured in place. Between June 30, 1892, and September 30, 1892, 26,694 cubic yards were dredged by a hired dredge and the United States employees at a cost of about 24 cents a yard, measured in place. Dredging was then stopped, and work on a new dredge owned by the United States was begun. At the close of June, 1893, this dredge was nearly ready for work. It was a powerful dredge of the Osgood pattern, with main engines 12 inches in diameter and 18 inches stroke. The new dredge began work on the canal November 21, and was operated continuously till April 30, 1894, when it was laid up, as the funds were getting low and the old rice-field lands where it was working were excessively sickly. During the five months it excavated 6,075 linear feet of canal, 7 feet deep and 50 feet wide, at a cost of 3.7 cents per cubic yard, measured in place. In this price every expenditure made from the appropriation for any purpose is included. More work was done by the United States with its own labor and dredge in five months than had been accomplished by contract on this improvement in any two years. The cost was $4,000, as compared with about $30,000 under the most favorable contract ever obtained here for like work and equal advance of canal. The work was also more thoroughly done."

In the following year, he made this statement:

"The dredge owned and operated by the United States continued dredging, extending the canal 6,500 linear feet, 50 feet wide and 7 feet deep at low water, and cut a turnout aggregating 1,250, making the total excavation 7,750 linear feet, which corresponded with 121,845 cubic yards and 1,102 stumps. . . . The dredging during the year has cost 4.9 cents per cubic yard. The cheapest contract price ever received was 37½ cents per cubic yard, exclusive of superintendence."

The same officer, in his report for 1896, referring to the improvement of Charleston Harbor, stated:

"In 1891, the Government plant, operated by hired labor, and Mr. Friday's plant operated under his contract, worked together, the former on the south and the latter on the north jetty. It was found that the cost that year by hired labor was $1.70 per ton, including office expenses, and superintendence, as compared with $2.20 per ton for exactly the same work by contract, including inspection."

On the work of the Potomac Flats Improvement at Washington, some years ago, bids for embankment work along the margin

of the fill were invited. The lowest bid received, after public advertisement for proposals, was about 16 cents per cubic yard. The bids were rejected and the same dredges that were to have been used were hired from the lowest bidder at a price that gave him a profit, and enabled the Government to do the work at about one-half the cost it would have been had it been let by contract.

The above are examples showing that Government work does not always cost more than work by contract. On the Santee River, the conditions were similar in some respects to those on the Isthmus. The place was so unhealthy that only negroes could work there, and even they suffered from malaria to some extent.

But were it true that the work would cost a little more if done by day's labor, it is believed that this is the best way to do it. The United States does not stand in the position of a private corporation with reference to this canal. A corporation would build it, as other canals are built, for what could be made out of it, by levying tolls on commerce. Of course, the Government expects a return from its investment; but it will be chiefly in the development of the industries of the country, the advantages it affords for national defence and for the general good of mankind. The motive is as high morally as the work is grand physically. There will be loss of life in carrying out the enterprise, even under the most favorable conditions; but if the work be done by the United States employing its own labor, the loss of life can be kept at a minimum, even though the work cost more money.

One of the objections to the Panama route was, that the scandals connected with it in the early days had so outraged the public conscience, that decent people hesitated to take up an enterprise that had been so tainted with fraud. The fact that the New Panama Canal Company had rescued it from its former pitiable condition did not count for much. Many people were hostile to it just the same. They said, "We want nothing to do with an undertaking so foully smirched." If, however, the work be done by the United States directly by employing its own labor, there ought to be no room for scandals.

This great Government can procure labor and machinery at as low prices as contractors can. It matters not where the labor may come from, whether from Asia, Africa or America. The problem of securing it may be troublesome, but it will not be rendered less so by shifting the responsibility on a contractor.

Another question is, Where will the labor come from? White labor from the United States, except in the mechanical trades, is out of the question. The number of laborers of any color or kind on the Isthmus is small, and the quality poor. Along the line of the railroad between Colon and Panama, there are settlements composed of people from almost every clime on the face of the earth, but they will furnish few laborers. Perhaps 1,500 or 2,000 Jamaica negroes could be obtained. The native Isthmian will not work. He is naturally indolent; not over strong; has no ambition; his wants are few in number and easily satisfied. He can live for a few cents a day, and he prefers to take it easy, swinging in a hammock and smoking cigarettes. The native population is wholly unavailable.

The Jamaica negro, and under this term are included the negroes of most of the islands under British control, makes a good laborer. He is fairly industrious; not addicted to drink; can speak English; has ambition, though it is chiefly to become an independent British subject; he is willing to work, but he must have an inordinate number of holidays. He is alert in driving a bargain, and possesses many of the traits of our own native down-easter. He is not deficient in intelligence, and he recognizes conditions that are favorable to bargain-making quite as readily as his northern neighbor. When the demand for labor becomes greater than the supply, he will be quick to grasp the situation and make the best of it. He lays great stress on being a British subject, and vehemently claims British protection whenever he thinks his rights are invaded or curtailed. But there is not enough of these negroes on the Isthmus, and it is doubtful whether or not the Islands can supply the deficiency.

The Chinese coolie will stand the climate; he is industrious, not difficult to manage; but he cannot speak English, and, as soon as he gets a few dollars, he wants to keep a store. Will the people of the United States consent to the importation of coolie labor for this work?

Contractors would naturally want to import coolie labor, because it is cheap and the supply is practically inexhaustible. The Panama Canal Company tried coolies and also negroes imported direct from Africa, but neither gave satisfaction. With both classes came diseases which carried off many and rendered others helpless.

Weighing all the circumstances and viewing all the conditions, it seems that the best solution of the labor problem is to procure the labor in the United States. The Southern negro, just as well as the Jamaica negro, accustomed to the warm climate of our Southern States, it is believed, would furnish an excellent class of labor for work on the Isthmus. He is American born, speaks the language of the men under whom he will serve, is amenable to discipline, is temperate in his habits, is not honeycombed with disease, is intelligent, industrious and ambitious; the money that is paid to him will, as a rule, return to the United States. That he can stand the climate is the firm conviction of many who have sought a practical solution of the labor problem.

As already stated, the work will be done largely by machinery, which will require a considerable number of men skilled in the various mechanical trades. A large number of engine-men, to do work for which the ordinary laborer is not fitted, will be needed. Mechanics will, as a rule, from necessity be white men, but their stay on the Isthmus should not be prolonged. White mechanics and colored laborers from the United States and the West-Indian Islands would seem to offer the best solution of the labor problem on the Isthmus. The army of the United States is composed partly of colored troops. It is the universal testimony of officers that they make excellent soldiers and can stand the heat of the tropics.

The ordinary laborers should be divided into two classes, with a slight difference in pay to encourage individual industry and attention to duty. They should agree to work for two years, unless sooner discharged. They should be quartered in buildings provided by the Government, supplied with good, wholesome food, a certain amount of light cotton working-clothes and medical attendance. At the end of two years' creditable service, they should be entitled to discharge and transportation back to the place at which they were recruited. This would apply whether they came from the United States or from the Islands of the Caribbean Sea. No man should be engaged and sent to the Isthmus who is not physically and mentally sound and fitted for the work, to determine which he should be required to pass an examination no less rigid than that for enlisting men in the army. Similar but less stringent rules should apply to mechanics, clerks, draftsmen, overseers, etc.; but, inasmuch as many of these would be engaged

for shorter periods of service, special rules would govern in such cases.

The men should be divided into squads, with a master-laborer or master-mechanic at the head of each, according to the class of men that compose it. A master-carpenter, for instance, would have a certain number of carpenters under him, a master-mason a certain number of masons, and so on. Two or more squads of laborers or mechanics would be under an overseer. The overseers, in turn, would be subordinate to the engineers. The latter would be assigned to special works, such as the construction of a dam, lock or a section, and the number of overseers, etc., under him would depend on the extent and character of the work in his charge. All matters pertaining to the pay of the men, except keeping the time, should be attended to by a Pay Department.

A certain number of physicians should be assigned, to see that the hygienic conditions are kept up to the proper standard, and to determine when a man is fit or unfit for work.

The details of the foregoing plan could not, perhaps, be worked out beforehand. Many would be settled according to conditions arising from time to time. The main idea is to secure an organization of laborers and mechanics, working directly under the Government and under the absolute control of the officers for all purposes of work, similar to the organization of an army. Such an organization would be impracticable under the contract system.

The construction of the Panama Canal is the greatest engineering work that has ever yet been undertaken by man. All other canals sink into insignificance beside it. The Suez Canal, which gave De Lesseps an undeserved reputation as an engineer, is nothing more than a ditch cut through a low neck of land connecting the continents of Asia and Africa. There were no special difficulties to be overcome. The quantity of excavation was large, but it seemed larger than it really was, because the tools with which it was done were far below the present standard of efficiency. The fear was that after the light, sandy soil had been excavated and piled up on the sides, the wind might blow it back into the canal faster than it could be taken out. At Panama all kinds of difficult engineering problems are to be met and solved. An engineering organization the most complete and perfect of its kind is therefore essential for the economical and efficient construction of this vast work.

An organization of mechanics and laborers modelled on the plan thus outlined or on similar principles, will, it is firmly believed, meet the physical requirement of the labor problem at Panama in a less objectionable manner than any other. But something more is needed. This organization will form a body of men capable of performing efficient service only when properly directed. Each particular part of the organization must work in harmony with the other parts, else there will be confusion. The organization must, therefore, have a head with brains, to direct harmonious action. There should be one Chief Engineer having entire charge of all matters relating to construction, and not burdened with outside matters. On this chief the responsibility for the faithful execution of the work should fall. Hence, he should have authority. This authority should be supreme in all matters relating to construction; in other matters it might be limited. He need not be responsible for the plans, but he must be for their faithful execution. If he has a doubt as to their practicability, he should resign his trust. If he desires counsel and advice on any matters within the scope of his duties, he should be enabled to refer such matters to a Board of Experts, who could give more study to the question than he. Except in an advisory capacity, it is believed that Boards are undesirable. It is notorious that they are inefficient for executive work. The Secretary or Chairman or some other member becomes the moving power, and the Board becomes a screen. Responsibility must be concentrated to be effective. The larger the Board, the greater its incompetence in executive business. In an advisory capacity Boards may be of great value, but their functions must not extend to executive work.*

The Chief Engineer should be a man in vigorous health, not too far advanced in years and yet possessing the discretion and judgment that come with years. He should have had experience in the management of men and works, and a thorough knowledge of the principles of engineering. An engineer is not a spontaneous growth. Eminence in his calling is only reached by hard work and a diligent application to all the intricate arts of the profession.

* Since the above was written a Chief Engineer has been appointed. The writer is not personally acquainted with him, but it is understood that he possesses in a high degree the qualities mentioned.

Under the immediate orders of the Chief Engineer there should be a certain number of Division Engineers, each having direct charge of the work of his division. These Division Engineers should be men of the same high professional attainments as the chief, lacking only, perhaps, his experience. They should be capable of taking the place of the chief, if circumstances should make it necessary.

Geographically, the work on the canal will naturally be divided into three divisions, the Atlantic, the Central and the Pacific. The first would comprise all the work between the Caribbean Sea and the Bohio Dam, including the dam, the locks and spillway; the second should include all work between the Bohio Dam and the Pedro Miguel locks, but not including the latter; the third should include the Pedro Miguel locks and the work between them and the Pacific.

With such an organization, it is believed that the work can be carried on efficiently, economically and with credit to the Government that has undertaken the solution of this great problem in which the entire world is interested.

PETER C. HAINS.

ARMS AND AMMUNITION IN JAPAN.

BY WM. H. BLUMENSTEIN.

If it requires genius to make a useful invention, it requires an equally high degree of ingenuity to adapt a mechanical device, or force, to concrete needs and conditions. In the matter of such ingenuity the Japanese are past masters.

In nothing does the clear perception of technical detail—the sure eye, the deft hand—express itself as admirably as in the ways and means adopted, and adapted, for the national defence and everything pertaining and relating thereto.

To get a proper conception of the stupendousness of the modern Japanese achievement we must bear in mind how forbiddingly the Empire kept itself aloof from Occidental civilization—that is to say, from the gradual accumulation of thought, conjecture, experiment, and experience in every department of science, of technique, of national life, and the sum total of inherited and acquired accomplishments expressed in the word "culture."

We behold with awe the marvellous monuments of alien genius, the Maya, the Aztec, the Peruvian, in America, the Burmese, Hindu, and Chinese, in Asia—architectural and sculptural wonders, sublime in conception, gigantic in proportions, tremendous in effort and overwhelming in effect; but there is a gulf between the spirit that created them and our own mental world that seems to be unbridgeable; a difference that seems to deny a common root of human nature and feeling.

However, the very massiveness of the barbarian achievement points to an explanation of this difference. Here thousands and thousands of human beings must have labored together, directed by one master mind. The individual counted for nothing; he was only a part of the whole, whose sole and chief duty was blind

devotion and obedience to the ruler. Among less intelligent races, this subjugation led to a stolid, non-progressive fanaticism; with the more highly organized Japanese, it developed an intense patriotism, a love of, and pride in, their country such as it would be hard to parallel.

On the other hand, the Victorian Era will ever stand out pre-eminently as an age in which the human mind took giant strides forward. In America no less than in almost every one of the European countries arose mental giants, men of heroic genius, of dauntless spirit, of keenest penetration. It was the age that invented the railroad and the electric telegraph, conquering time and space, revolutionizing national life, vesting man with a strength, a force, a power hitherto undreamt of.

Well equipped with the attainments of his time, Commodore Perry approached the Japanese in 1853, with demands for treaties and open ports. The hated and despised foreigners had a way of reinforcing their request that was new, and some bright and far-sighted men of Japan conceived the idea of going abroad and judging for themselves how other countries compared with the fair Dai Nippon. They went and saw, saw with Japanese eyes and minds, and their hearts began to tremble for their country. They returned home and urged upon their compatriots the necessity of arming and protecting themselves; and like one man the nation responded. The sublime simplicity with which the greatest sacrifices of brain and treasure were made, will be, in times to come, a prolific source of inspiration to Japanese bards. From the Emperor down, throughout the nation, implicit trust was reposed in the most enlightened and most broad-minded of their people, and they went to work to remodel Japan without impairing her integrity.

How this was accomplished has already been described in whole libraries of books on Japan and her people, without, however, giving the Old World an adequate conception of the minute completeness with which Occidental arts and crafts were acquired and assimilated. The movement being principally a political one, the national defence became, of course, the main feature of this modernization, and a review of the Government institutions may shed some light on the matter.

With true Japanese exclusiveness and self-reliance, the aim was, from the very start, to make the country independent of the

western world. The ways and means were simple and direct. Bright young men were sent to the various European and American seats of learning and industry, there to make themselves masters of all they could learn. On their return, they became associates and interpreters to the various foreign experts who had been engaged to establish the first or model plants and factories, with imported machines, tools and implements. These, once completed, served as standards for as many more establishments of the kind as the country required, built and operated by native talent without foreign aid or interference.

No European or American gunpowder plant is as complete, on as grand a scale, as thoroughly up to date, as convenient and practical as the Japanese Government Plant at Meguro, near Tokyo, for the manufacture of all kinds of ordnance and blasting powders. The broad brow of a hill, falling rather steeply down on one side into a swampy rice-field, has been utilized for the purpose with consummate skill.

The plant is patrolled by a detachment of soldiers, who also assist at the proving tests on the well-equipped grounds set apart for this purpose. Each manipulation in the manufacturing process has its full allotment of space; yet not a foot is wasted. The buildings are massive, suitable for the purpose, neat and well kept, but without a trace of anything superfluous. Along the main street, which runs the entire length of the factory grounds, is laid out a narrow-gauge railroad, and overhead you see the wire-rope power-transmission connecting all departments. In spite of all this, the picture is unmistakably Japanese, not only because of the turned-up corners of the massive roofs, and the graceful outlines of the supports of the transmission, which are of masonwork, but because of a hundred little details in the treatment of each section. I will only mention the little cascade in which a streamlet falls down the hill, the waters of which are required for the manufacturing process. The land adjoining this hill used to be swamp,—rice-fields. Now it is drained and reclaimed, and the buildings for the heavy machinery and presses are located in this section, reared on earthquake-proof piles.

Military precision reigns supreme; and in spite of the working of powerful engines and all the humming of wheels and stamping of crushers and all the other noises of a busy industrial establishment, which turns out some five to six thousand pounds

of finished material every day, and gives occupation to half a thousand workmen, the picture is a serene one, free from the smut and dirt of labor. Free also from unpleasant memories; for there has never yet been an untoward explosion or fatality, such as blurs the records of many a similar institution under Caucasian management. Faithful devotion and strict obedience bring about unremitting attention to duty, and thereby preclude disasters, which generally are traceable to somebody's negligence.

That Japan now produces her own saltpetre in artificial plantations in sufficient quantities for her needs, is well known. Sulphur is found in abundance, as in any volcanic region, and the material for charcoal is also provided for. Guaiacum, which yields the best charcoal for powder purposes, does not thrive in Japan; but there are plenty of alders, which furnish the next best grade. Large groves of this tree cover the old lava beds on the slopes of the Fujiyama. The logs were treated according to all the rules of the art, but the wood was of so great a density, and its fibrous construction so intricate (owing to the extremely slow growth in the unyielding soil), that the charcoal made from it could be disintegrated and reduced to a granular powder only with the utmost difficulty, and with but indifferent success. No sooner had the Government been informed of this fact than a search was made throughout the land for something better than the alders of Fuji San, and it was discovered that on the islands of Oki, on the northern shore of Dai Nippon, in the Sea of Japan, there flourished splendid alders, of rapid growth and finely fibred, porous wood. Experiments proved this variety to yield an ideally good charcoal for the manufacture of powder. Immediately a forestry station was established on the islands, to take care that the supply of this wood should never be exhausted.

Here, then, we have the three chief ingredients of black and brown gunpowder, saltpetre, sulphur and charcoal, abundantly produced in the country.

The powder factory at Iwahana, which lies in the direction of Nikko, was built by the Japanese, without assistance from foreigners, after the model of Meguro, but on a larger scale. It is also well equipped with all the apparatus and machinery for the elaboration of the raw materials and the manufacture of ordnance powder, as well as all kinds of blasting powder for engineering and mining purposes. It supplies the Hokkaido, *i.e.*, the

northern provinces of Dai Nippon and the islands lying in that direction.

Very different are the conditions surrounding Udji, the powder works of the South. These are located in the neighborhood of Kyoto, the old capital of the Emperors of feudal times. The district is renowned as the best tea region in all Japan. The excellence of the product is due, not so much to better soil or attention, as to more favorable climatic conditions than exist in any other section of the country. Hence every square foot of ground was devoted to tea culture. Yet, when the War Department decided that it needed a powder plant in that province, some fifty-odd precious acres were promptly given up by the farmer to the soldier. There is something almost pathetic in the fine old tea plants that grow within the very grounds of the factory, as the builders,—of course, Japanese,—did not have the heart to destroy them, so long as the room they occupied was not actually wanted for buildings and roads.

Udji's specialty is smokeless powder, and it has the very finest distillery for the alcohol required in the manufacturing process, I have, without any exception, seen anywhere. Here, also, is a complete plant for the manufacture of guncotton, where the raw material of domestic or imported growth is picked, cleaned, dried, and passed through the various complicated, and in many stages rather perilous, manipulations of nitration. The army of workmen move about with the precision of clock-work, under the eyes of numerous foremen, inspectors and superintendents, and accidents are almost, and fatalities entirely, unknown.

Three million yen (about $1,500,000) have been expended in the construction and equipment of this plant. Foreigners, remembering the enormous sums appropriated for Government buildings and constructions in their respective countries, rarely believe that such a splendid "job" could have been carried out without a proportionate amount of "boodle"; but in this respect the Japanese are not yet "up to date."

In times of peace, about four hundred men and two hundred girls find here steady employment, and the machinery develops from seven to eight hundred horse-power. All of the buildings are of framework, with cement floorings.

The alcohol, by the way, is made from grain, corn, rye, wheat and barley, raised on the numerous agricultural experiment sta-

tions, after American patterns, which are scattered over the fertile Hokkaido, in which the Japanese husbandman obtains valuable instruction in modern methods of farming. In every direction is manifested the ambition to make Japan independent of the outside world.

By far the most important of all establishments of this kind is the Imperial powder plant at Itabashi, which is again located in close proximity to the capital. This is practically an experiment station, where the merits of new inventions and discoveries are investigated and put to a practical test. It is of all plants the most complete, making every kind of ordnance powder—viz., black, brown, and smokeless (grains, leaflets, tube or macaroni, cordite, etc.)—for firearms of all sizes up to the largest. Its chemical laboratories, and the apparatus for the numerous auxiliary processes and manipulations, are most complete, practical and efficient. As a matter of course, it is seldom that a foreigner is admitted within the high gate. All the officials, from the director down, are natives, and concerning them I want to say that not only the chiefs of the various departments, but their assistants as well, are highly trained experts, each of whom has spent several years at European and American universities, acquiring a thorough mastery of his specialty and getting his mental horizon widened to the farthest extent, so that he might return to his country exceptionally well fitted for the position he was to fill. Scientists of the first rank, who anywhere else would be hailed as stars of the first magnitude, work here unknown to fame, satisfied to devote their matchless genius and knowledge to the welfare and the glory of their country, not with blind fanaticism, but with the enthusiasm of conviction, the noble fire of the idealist. The individual counts for nothing; the country, the Emperor, for everything.

Meguro, Iwahana, Udji and Itabashi are under the superintendence of the War Department, while the Navy Department is more especially supplied by the factory at Oji, whose specialty is smokeless powder for naval guns and the charges for the projectiles intended for explosion with lyddite effect. The establishment is situated a little to the north of Tokyo and is of very recent creation. It is planned on the very largest scale, and it is needless to add that here, too, are found all the admirable features embodied in the other plants.

From this it will be seen that the capital lies within a semi-circle of powder plants,—Meguro to the east, Oji to the north, and Itabashi to the west. The southern side is open to the sea. In the city itself is located the arsenal for small arms,—rifles, complete with bayonets, small field-guns and sabres for the cavalry. It is housed in the fortlike residence of an old-time provincial governor or Daimyo, and the original moat and rampart that protected the estate in turbulent times are still preserved. The age of the place can be surmised from the venerable old sycamores that have grown on the very crest of the wall. The buildings lie in the centre of an exquisite old-Japanese garden, full of delightful nooks and picturesque vistas, fine old trees rising out of a mass of flowering shrubbery and mossy rocks, reflected in pellucid sheets of water through which goldfish dart in all directions, or velvety lawns, glittering cascades, graceful bridges over pretty streamlets.

The beautifully proportioned, wide halls, in which feudal lords once dwelt in state, are now filled with machinery, shafting and belting, and the hum and rattle of mills and lathes, of piston and hammer, of gearing and saws. One section is given up to the manufacture of rifle barrels, all of small calibre. The blanks for these are mostly imported in the required length and size, so that they have only to be bored and grooved. In another section, the rifle stocks are made; in a third, the small parts of the weapon are produced and assembled. Still another section furnishes the bayonets; and, when the rifles are complete and adjusted, they are taken to the proving grounds, where a corps of sharp-shooters systematically tests each one. Those which prove to be not absolutely perfect are returned to the factory to be righted; the accepted ones are stamped and sent to the magazines to be stored for future use. The capacity of the arsenal, in times of peace, is 500 complete rifles per day of ten working hours, with facilities for quadrupling the output by working day and night.

All this constitutes only one part of the establishment. There are a sabre factory and a plant for the manufacture of all the ammunition used in the rifles and guns, and the capacity of this is proportionate to that of the other section.

The heavy artillery guns (Arisaka's model), howitzers, mortars, long-barrelled guns and cannons for the navy and for coast de-

fence, as well as the shells or projectiles for these, are cast at the arsenal of Osaka. Most of the big lathes and milling-machines and drills, as well as the cranes and derricks for the handling of the huge pieces, are of Japanese construction, made after small imported models.

Osaka, the second city of the Empire, which is often called the Japanese Manchester, lies on a rather shallow bay, and is therefore accessible from the sea only by small, light-draft vessels, so that no trans-oceanic shipping can be done from there. To facilitate the transportation of heavy castings and big guns, a canal has been dug for the exclusive use of the arsenal, starting within its grounds, passing under the heavy rampart, and going through a rather secluded section of the country to the seacoast.

The working capacity of Osaka arsenal it is difficult to estimate, nor would the War Department allow information on that point to be spread broadcast. It is scarcely conceivable that more than an approximate figure is set down for it. Suffice it to say, that everybody is expected to do his best and is doing it. This training of legions of working-men and officers of high grade or low grade in faithful devotion to duty and country, is in itself an inestimable asset to the credit of Japan.

A section of the grounds is given up to the harness and saddlery works, and to the manufacture of bits and stirrups and all the other parts of the harness as used by the artillery and cavalry; in other words, these two branches of the army are supplied here with all their accoutrements.

The principal naval port, and the oldest one, is that of Yokoshuka, on the Yokohama Bay. From the land side, it is practically inaccessible as it is surrounded by steep mountains, the coast range reaching here its wildest section. The railroad, which connects the port with the capital overland, pierces its way through innumerable tunnels, and rumbles over deep gorges and chasms on lofty bridges that are triumphs of engineering. The main part of the town is occupied by commissary stores, warehouses, provision depots, etc.; for here is the base of supplies of the Japanese navy. Without the navy docks, Yokoshuka would still be the insignificant fishing village it was for centuries up to twenty-odd years ago, when the secluded yet deep-sea harbor was found to be the best possible naval port the Empire could desire. The dry docks are large enough to admit of five men-of-war to be

built simultaneously and finished within a twelvemonth, besides countless smaller vessels for all purposes. It is as busy and bustling a place as one can wish to see, and the solemn hills around it are forever reechoing with the clatter and clamor of ceaseless industry.

The population of the town consists almost exclusively of the officers and employees of the navy-yard and their families, and the greatest feasts they know of are the launchings of the big war-vessels, when the Emperor comes down from Tokyo in all the splendor of his gold-laced uniform and surrounded by his magnificent suite. Every available space glows with flags and flowers; everybody is in holiday attire, happy, enthusiastic, proud of his country and its enlightened ruler, whose high mind read aright the signs of the times and made New Japan a possibility. The majority of ordinary mortals feel more or less elated in the presence of men of distinction, of great achievement or vast wealth. What, then, must these people feel when they behold the descendant of an interminable line of Emperors,—great ones or small ones, but Emperors nevertheless—compared with whom Romanoff or Hohenzollern, Habsburg or Bourbon, is but a matter of yesterday.

A word about the European style of uniform worn by the Government employees. It was not for love of foreign fashions that this was adopted. It is generally discarded as soon as office hours are over. The sole reason for its adoption lies in the traditions and ceremonies that cling to the official garb of native design. Rather than shock the pious feeling towards ancient custom,—that sensitive reverence of the past that is so easily ridiculed to death, and that generally buries in its own grave the self-esteem and self-reliance of the nation,—the dress was laid aside, and the difficulty was overcome without violating either the old forms on the one hand, or the demands of modern exigencies on the other.

The wharves and the science of marine construction were acquired by Japan in scarcely more than a decade. It is this sudden springing up of new industries, this quick mastery of intricate manufacturing processes, which were absolutely unknown when the present experts were children, which have no connection with the inner life of the people, no root in ancient traditions, which originated with the unloved aliens and still bear the character of their mental world,—that makes the achievement so stupendous,

all the more as it takes in not only the "four hundred" of Japanese officialdom, but a very large contingent of the broad base of the people, of the nation.

Fifty years ago, Japan was a mediæval, feudal state, in that political stage of development from which Europe emerged about the time America was discovered. The degree of civilization the Caucasian race laboriously attained in something like four centuries, has been won in the Land of the Rising Sun in as many decades, and without any disintegration, in a well-aimed and safely guided course of natural, healthy progress. Surely, this phenomenal growth cannot suddenly stop short. But what will it bring forth? The struggle now going on in the Far East for the hegemony of the Asiatic Pacific, will settle a far deeper problem concerning the history of mankind than the statesmen and diplomats of to-day have yet dared to contemplate.

WM. H. BLUMENSTEIN.

THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY—ITS PRACTICABILITY AND COST.

BY THOMAS HODGINS, JUDGE OF THE ADMIRALTY COURT, CANADA.

THE Alaskan-Boundary Tribunal having, by answering certain questions, given its interpretation of the third and fourth articles of the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1825 which defined the Alaska-Canada international boundary, it now becomes important to consider whether the boundary line described in the fourth article and in the answer to the fifth question, is practicable, as an engineering work, by staking it out and erecting monuments on the ground; or is financially reasonable as to its cost.

The third article of the Treaty provided that, after leaving the Portland Channel and the 56th degree of north latitude, "the line of demarcation shall follow the crest (*crête*) of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the 141st degree of west longitude."

The fourth article prescribed conditional limitations to this boundary line as follows:

"With reference to the line of demarcation laid down in the preceding article, it is understood, first, that the island called Prince of Wales Island shall belong wholly to Russia; second, that wherever the crest of the mountains, which extend in a direction parallel to the coast from the 56th degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude, shall prove to be at a distance of more than ten marine leagues from the Ocean, the limit between the British possessions and the strip of coast which is to belong to Russia as above mentioned, shall be formed by a line parallel to the sinuosities of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of ten marine leagues therefrom."

Tersely paraphrased, the article may be read thus:

"Wherever the crest of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast . . . shall prove to be at a distance of more than ten

marine leagues from the Ocean, . . . the line parallel to the sinuosities of the coast shall never exceed the distance of ten marine leagues therefrom."

The fifth question founded on the said article and proposed to the Tribunal reads:

"In extending the line of demarcation from the point on the parallel of the 56th degree of north latitude, following the crest of the mountains situated parallel to the coast until its intersection with the 141st degree of longitude west of Greenwich, subject to the condition that if such line should anywhere exceed the distance of ten marine leagues from the Ocean, then the boundary between the British and Russian possessions should be formed by a line parallel to the sinuosities of the coast, and distant therefrom more than ten marine leagues, was it the intention and meaning of the said Convention of 1825 that there should remain in the exclusive possession of Russia a continuous fringe, or strip, of coast on the mainland, not exceeding ten marine leagues in width, separating the British possessions from the bays, ports, inlets, havens and waters of the Ocean, and extending from the said point of the 56th degree of latitude north to a point where such line of demarcation should intersect the 141st degree of longitude west of Greenwich?"

Compared with the text of the Treaty, the recital may pass; but the question introduces a new expression, not in the Treaty, nor a fair paraphrase of its terms: "Bays, ports, inlets, havens and waters of the Ocean." Had the question used the expression, "separating the British Possessions from the territorial waters indenting the coast of the mainland"; or "was it the intention and meaning of the said Convention of 1825 that the expression 'sinuosities of the coast' should include such territorial waters as bays, ports, inlets, havens and waters indenting the coast of the mainland," the difficulties of giving an intelligible and legal meaning to the question in a simply affirmative answer would have been materially lessened.

International Law, being a science, has certain terms of art, such as "ocean," "coast," "bay," "shore," etc., which have now universally recognized and well-understood political meanings among nations when used in their international treaties,—though they may differ in some cases from their geographical meanings. But, without at present further criticising the form of the question, it would appear that the majority of the Tribunal, by their answer to the fifth question, decided that "*ocean*" was to be the base line for the measurement of the inland width of the strip, or

fringe, of coast; and the practical question now to be considered is, How and where will the engineer or surveyor find the fixed points of his base line along the 500 miles of coast, so as to stake inland a sinuous boundary line "parallel to the sinuosities" of such base line, and so that the inland international boundary line shall be such a fairly marked counterpart of the sinuosities of the ocean base line, that neither nation shall gain or lose territory which an inaccurate inland measurement might award.

If, then, the "ocean" of the question is the governing base line, International Law must be appealed to for the recognized meaning of that term.

The sea water along the coast of a country is not, according to that law, "ocean"; nor are the rocks or shoals along such coast the points where the "ocean" is found. By that law, the "low-water mark" of the tidal sea along the coast is the primary factor in determining where ocean begins. A marine league seaward from low-water mark is the marine belt of "territorial water" which is part of the maritime territory, and subject to the sovereignty, of the nation owning the coast. Outside that marine league, or belt, of territorial water is the "ocean," which is the common highway for the ships of all nations, and is subject to no sovereignty. "Ocean" being made the base line from which the inland width of the ten-marine-league strip of coast is to be measured, it follows that all along the strip of coast, the "low-water mark" must be ascertained, and from it an inland distance of nine marine leagues must be accurately (if possible) ascertained; for, as the Treaty prescribes that the inland width of the strip of coast shall never exceed "ten marine leagues from the ocean," the one league of "territorial water" and the nine inland leagues from "low-water mark," make the ten marine leagues prescribed. That prescribed inland width must be scientifically ascertained and staked along the interior land, as engineers or surveyors would be bound to do, if they were surveying and staking a similar sinuous dividing line between two adjoining farms of a prescribed and parallel inland width from a similarly fixed sinuous base line, or low-water mark, along an ocean coast, bay shore or river bank. How the base line of low-water mark along the 500 miles of ocean or seacoast can be ascertained, must be left to the investigation of experts. At present it would seem to be an engineering impossibility.

The same difficulties would have to be encountered by the engineers and surveyors if the nature-made coast-line of the mainland had been declared to be the base line from which the inland width of the strip of coast was to be staked. The "sinuosities of the coast" would have to be reproduced on the inland territory along which the international boundary line should be staked.

This view is sustained by the opinion of Mr. Dall, one of the engineering experts employed by the United States to report on the practicability of marking on the ground the international boundary line described in the Treaty of 1825, "parallel to the sinuosities of the coast." He reported as follows:

"In short, the summit of the mountains is wholly impracticable. We may then fall back on the line 'parallel to the windings (sinuosities) of the coast.' Let any one with a pair of drawing compasses having one leg a pencil point, draw this line on the United States Coast Survey Map of Alaska (No. 960 of 1884). The result is sufficient to condemn it. Such a line could not be surveyed; it crosses itself in many places, and indulges in myriads of knots and triangles. The line actually drawn as the boundary on that map omits these intricacies, and is intended merely as an approximation. It would be subject to almost insuperable difficulties for the surveyor, simplified as it is, and the survey would cost more than the whole territory cost originally. These are the false geographical assumptions on which the language of the Treaty was based, and are the difficulties they offer when it is proposed to realize by survey the verbal boundary."

And as to the mountain-crest boundary, he said:

"Shall we skip this way or that with our zigzag boundary, impossible to survey, except at a fabulous expense, and a half-century of labor?"

Mr. Secretary Bayard also stated, in a despatch to the American Ambassador in London, his opinion that the line traced on the Coast Survey Map was "as conjectural and theoretical as was the mountain-summit line traced by Vancouver"; and he added:

"The line is, in fact, such a line as it is next to impossible to survey through a mountainous region, and its actual location there by a Surveying Commission would be nearly as much a matter of conjecture as tracing it on paper with a pair of dividers."

The impracticability of staking on the inland side of the strip of coast such a sinuous or zigzag boundary line, was judicially affirmed by one of the State Supreme Courts when adjudicating

upon a similar expression to that used in the Treaty of 1825: "ten leagues from and parallel with the coast." The Court said:

"How can this line be drawn parallel to the natural coast, which has every imaginable curvature and sinuosity? After the whole country is surveyed, it may not be an entire impossibility to trace,—upon a map at least—the counterpart of the coast-line, however irregular and diversified. But can any one imagine that a Government would require, or attempt, such a line in a wilderness, for either political purposes, or for fixing the boundaries of property? It would require more numerous monuments and landmarks to ascertain its position than perhaps any other line ever drawn upon the face of the globe. Could any officer, or citizen, ever know with precision when he had passed the boundary; or could not an offender by dodging from post to pillar, or if he took a straight course, be in and out of the boundary one hundred times a day? Suppose every league of land was to have on its inland side curves corresponding to its curved coast boundary, the confusion and uncertainty of boundaries would be intolerable, and, of course, would never be permitted. The surveyors had no time for an operation almost impracticable in itself, and which, if completed, would have been preposterous as a line of boundary."*

During the argument before the Tribunal, a tracing was presented, indicating how the inland line of the boundary "parallel to the sinuosities of the coast," would have to be staked out and marked by monuments on the mountains or rolling land along the 500 miles of the strip of coast, showing, as stated by Mr. Dall, the "myriads of knots and triangles" it would make on the ground. Lord Alverstone, while admitting in his published judgment the practical difficulties of marking the actual localities of the Treaty-prescribed boundary line, said that, if, shortly after the Treaty, Great Britain and Russia had proceeded to draw or mark the boundary line, "the difficulties, and in certain events, the impossibilities of drawing a boundary in strict accordance with the Treaty, would have been made evident." And "to draw the boundary in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article IV. of the Treaty, I believe that according to the views expressed by both the American and British authorities it is impossible to do so." He added, however, that, while such impossibilities could not be cured by the Tribunal, but only by a new Treaty, "these considerations, strong as they are in favor of a just and equitable

* *Hamilton vs. Manifee*, 11 Texas Reports, 718.

modification of the original Treaty of 1825, do not, in my opinion, enable the Tribunal to put a different construction upon it."

From the estimates furnished by the United States engineers, the cost to the United States of marking the Treaty boundary line would be about $2,250,000. The estimated cost to Canada has been placed at $2,300,000, or a total of $4,550,000, which would certainly be exceeded. The length of time likely to be occupied in making necessary surveys and erecting the boundary monuments has been estimated at from seven to nine years. Mr. Dall's estimate makes it "a fabulous expense and a half-century of labor."

These considerations may well induce both nations to pause and reconsider their positions, and endeavor to find and agree upon a more practicable and less expensive boundary.

The political and geographical term "Ocean" has been given to such large bodies of water as the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, the Arctic Ocean, the Antarctic Ocean and the Indian Ocean. The political and legal expression, "bays, ports, inlets, havens and waters *of the Ocean,*" in this fifth question, has created a legal difficulty by the use of the words "of the Ocean"; for the term "Ocean" is found in Articles 1, 2, 4, 6 and 10 of the Treaty, and must be presumed to have a uniform meaning throughout the Treaty, as well as in the questions and answers. Had the question been worded so as to designate the "territorial waters" along the ocean coast of the mainland, as suggested above, it would have been a more intelligible paraphrase of the Treaty. What, then, in International Law are known as bays and waters "*of the Ocean*"? The following may suggest the answer: The Bay of Fundy, the Bay of Chaleur, Hudson's Bay, Delaware Bay, ten miles wide, Chesapeake Bay, twelve miles wide (both of which are claimed as "territorial waters" by the United States), the Bays of Biscay, Bengal, Korea, Honduras, and others which are more than the generally accepted mouth-width of six marine miles. New York Harbor and many similar "havens" are types of "waters of the ocean."

Further, the above enumeration imports the doctrine of law known as "*ejusdem generis*" and the rule known as *noscitur a sociis;* and, guided by the meaning applicable to the class of "Bays of the Ocean," it would seem logically and legally reasonable that the limitation, "of the ocean," should apply to and gov-

ern the interpretation to be given to the other enumerated classes of "waters of the ocean."

This fifth question, therefore, does not seem to have been accurately or scientifically drafted, having regard to the meanings of the political terms of the science of International Law; and it would seem to leave open questions for further discussion and negotiation; or what may be aptly phrased as "the argumentative strategy of diplomacy."

It is reported that the Tribunal signed maps on which boundary lines were traced. The Treaty of Reference said nothing about maps. The jurisdiction of the Tribunal was limited to giving answers to prescribed questions in respect to the true meaning and application of Articles III., IV., and V. of the Treaty of 1825; with power to take into consideration any action of the several governments which tended to show the original and effective understanding of the parties in respect to the limits of their several territorial jurisdictions under the said Treaties of 1825 and 1867. Any action beyond that jurisdiction would seem to be *ultra vires*. But if such boundary-traced maps are to be treated as schedules to the answers, then they must be construed as are the schedules to an ordinary statute; and the rule as to such is that, if the enacting part of the statute and the schedules to such statute conflict, the schedules must be construed so as to conform to such enacting part, and the statutory interpretation must prevail against any conflicting wording of the schedules. Therefore, the wording of the Treaty and of the answers must prevail against the boundary-line maps, should they be found to differ as to the inland distance from the base line of the "ocean," or to disregard the sinuosities of "low-water mark" along the natural coast.

The mutual interest and convenience of the peoples of both the United States and Canada, in the promotion of trade, and of the agricultural and mining industries, as well as in the administration of justice, in the wild and unsettled Alaska-Canada territory, disciplined by a loyal and just international amity, rather than attempting the construction of an impracticable and expensive boundary line, should—now that the Treaty has been construed,—dominate both nations, and perhaps lead them to consider some honorable adjustment or equitable compromise of their respective boundary rights in that territory.

THOMAS HODGINS.

THE DEGENERACY OF THE GERMAN ARMY.

BY WOLF VON SCHIERBRAND.

SOMETIMES the unexpected does happen. A small book, the literary firstling of a simple lieutenant of the line, has deeply stirred all classes in Germany. Even the national parliament, the Reichstag, has discussed it with much feeling. There is but one way to account for this: the reason for the profound anxiety felt is that this little book publicly and in plain language speaks out momentous truths about the German army, "the most cherished legacy" left him by his grandfather, as the Kaiser described it—truths which thousands had whispered before, but none had dared to speak aloud. The author of the book was promptly brought before a court-martial, sentenced to a long term of imprisonment, and dismissed from the army. His judges did not deny the fidelity of the portrait drawn by Lieutenant Bilse, but punished him rather because of it. For the same reason, too, the court ordered all the plates of the book and all the copies of it to be destroyed and its sale forbidden within the Empire. As a method of preventing its circulation, this measure failed wholly of its purpose.

What, then, does the book tell?

It presents in the guise of fiction—very thinly veiled fiction, indeed—a faithful picture of life in a German garrison of to-day, delineating the loose discipline and the looser living of officers and men. It shows pitilessly their total lack of ideals; the complete indifference of the officers to their profession; their incessant gaming and excessive drinking; the absence of intellectual pleasures and efforts, and the general engulfment in the grossest amusements and dissipations; the load of ever-accumulating debts under which nearly everybody groans; the miserable dependence of the officers on the forbearance of the army usurers

in Berlin or Cologne; and the striving to escape the gathering meshes of the drag-net by a "money-marriage," that being the sole escape possible from ultimate ruin and disgrace.

If the picture is a true one—and it was admitted to be true even by the members of the court-martial which condemned the young author; nay, more, even by the complaining witnesses, who recognized themselves in the figures of the tale, and who have since challenged Bilse to mortal combat to avenge the deadly insult of being held up to public ignominy—the German army is no longer what it has been universally supposed to be, namely, a model of strict discipline and of Spartan virtue. It is rather the reverse. And that invites a comparison.

Frederick the Great died in 1786, his army the finest in Europe. He had stood at bay, during a succession of wars which consumed more than half his reign of forty-six years, against the whole of Continental Europe, and he had vanquished his foes *seriatim* with his matchless band of veterans. Exactly twenty years after his death, Napoleon defeated the Prussians at Jena, routing them so utterly that Prussia tumbled like a house of cards. The monarchy practically ceased to exist for seven years, and Prussia, as a political and military power, was thrust back for fifty years to the second or third rank. Only 1866 and the battle of Sadowa restored her prestige. It was in recalling these days of contrite humiliation that the present Kaiser said, addressing his brilliant gathering of generals in the Hall of Glories at Berlin, on New Year's Day, 1900:

"The glorious soldiers of Frederick the Great had fallen asleep on their laurels, ossified in the trivial details of a senseless, antiquated drill; led by superannuated, unready, and unwarlike generals; their officers no longer used to serious work, and degenerated by luxury, sloth, and blind self-glorification. In a word, the army no longer sufficed for its task. It had forgotten its task. Severe was the punishment meted out to it by Heaven, a punishment which likewise chastised our people. Thrown into the dust were we. Frederick's fame paled, and his glorious banners were broken. In the seven long years of our hard servitude God taught our people to gather new strength."

Brave and timely words these, but it may be doubted if William II. had any idea that he was addressing a body of men who themselves fitted in rather closely with the description given of the men of 1806, that he, personally, is rapidly bringing the German

army to the sorry plight he spoke of? The parallel between conditions in 1806 and those in 1904 is a striking one. Pride goeth before a fall. The vainglorious, dissolute, overbearing, cowardly Prussian *junkers* and soldiers of 1806 have their counterparts in those of to-day. This has been pointed out before now in Germany, and has often been the subject of prophecy in the Reichstag itself. But ears have been deaf and eyes have been blind in the circles most concerned.

No one who has of recent years resided in Germany, who has had occasion to consort with the army there and has closely observed it, can have failed to remark its rapid decadence. Those dreadful diseases which are the punishment consequent on loose living are tainting officers and men alike to an incredible extent. In the military hospitals, the overwhelming majority of the patients are sufferers from such disorders. The French army during the Second Empire was not worse in this respect.

Gaming and betting are indulged in to an enormous extent in army circles. The Union Club and the Jockey Club in Berlin, both largely composed of officers, are perhaps the worst centres of fashionable dissipation in the Empire. High stakes are played for, tens of thousands often changing hands in a single night, the favorite games being vingt-et-un, baccarat, écarté, poker, lansquenet and others. It is at these clubs, and at the hundreds of smaller ones in the provinces, that the fatal taste for gaming and betting is first acquired, leading in many cases to disgrace, expatriation or suicide. The complete financial ruin of five of the oldest and most renowned Prussian noble families was accomplished at one of the above clubs in the course of a single season, not very long ago.

With this, too, there is an enormous amount of hard drinking. German army officers make French brandy their favorite tipple, or the regulation mess-punch, composed of a mixture of champagne, brandy, curaçoa, and rum—a mixture, by the way, said to have been invented by the Kaiser. At the innumerable banquets, luncheons, birthday fêtes of the sovereign or his family, of regimental chiefs, etc., and at the anniversary celebrations of battles in which particular regiments or corps distinguished themselves in the past, hard and fast drinking is the fashion, and failure to observe it is an unpardonable crime. Besides all this, luxury in its general aspects has obtained a firm foothold in the German

army everywhere. Out of every hundred officers, at least ninety live beyond their means.

As a dire result of all this, usury and "money-marriages" have become established features in life. It would require too much space to go into details, interesting enough as these are in themselves. Let it be enough to say that every garrison town in Germany is cursed by the presence of leeches, who first induce young and reckless officers to borrow on apparently easy terms, and next manipulate with diabolical cunning until they have involved their victims, and more especially the innocent families of their victims, so seriously as to lead usually to one of three alternatives: to the settlement of the debt, including an outrageous interest, a thing that burdens the paternal estate, family fortune, or salary expectations for many years, or the retirement of the officer in question; to the contracting of a "money-marriage," so called, which ties the young spendthrift to an unloved but richly dowered damsel (or widow), frequently with questionable family connections; or, lastly, to the summary dismissal and disgrace of the luckless wight, often to suicide or to crime. The whole German army is honeycombed with more or less sad cases of this description. So many scions of the fairest and oldest families in the Empire have, while serving in the army, fallen inextricably into the snares of these professional usurers, and have wedded a vulgar daughter of a *nouveau riche,* that but few of the ancient houses do not show to-day a commingling of "financial," especially Jewish financial, blood. That, however, is a matter about which there may well be two opinions. The great number of such mercenary matches, and their steady increase, have materially added to the lowering of moral standards in the army.

Against this whole train of evils the Kaiser, it is true, fulminates decrees and army orders. He did so for the first time on March 29th, 1890, when he issued a general army order in which, first, he stated that "not alone birth can to-day, as it did formerly, exclusively entitle to the prerogative of furnishing the officers for my army," and that the future of his army "rests also on the sons of estimable citizen families with whom the reverence for king and fatherland . . . is nurtured and cherished." He added:

"I strongly disapprove the idea that any officer in my army is to be estimated according to the size of his home allowance. On the contrary,

I rank in my mind those regiments the highest whose officers know how to do their full duty, joyously and with alacrity, and who nevertheless receive but modest allowances from their families. This is in accord with old Prussian traditions. I desire with all my heart that my officers, their duty done, shall enjoy life. But the growing luxury in the army must be seriously and persistently opposed."

During the eighties, and again during the nineties, occurred several unsavory trials in the army, brought about by huge scandals attendant on the ruin and disgrace of many young officers due to reckless card-playing. The worst of these was the one at Hanover, which led to the discharge from the army of scores, including one of the Kaiser's aides-de-camp. On February 23d, 1899, the Kaiser issued a decree to the army in which he said:

"Late occurrences have shown me again the frequency of dishonest but alluring offers made by professional money-lenders to the officers of my army. . . . I demand the use of every means to keep such temptations away from my officers. My previous order of July 5, 1888, must remain before every officer's eyes as the expression of my deliberate will. I herewith ordain that henceforth each and every officer be bound to report to his superiors all offers of corrupt money transactions which shall reach him. . . ."

Yet the Kaiser himself is largely—one might almost say solely—responsible for the present highly unsatisfactory condition of his army, a condition which these and subsequent orders have done nothing to improve. It is well known how, by his personal example, he encourages luxurious living among his corps of officers. He attends annually scores of officers' festivities which are always costly and usually marked by excessive drinking, swaggering talk and unhealthy sycophancy. The toasts on these occasions breathe, as a rule, the spirit of reckless bravado now so rampant throughout Germany, and especially in the army. In this, too, as the world knows, the present Kaiser has too often furnished his people an example. His speeches during the troubles in China, wild and almost raving in their lack of restraint, are still unforgotten in this connection.

But his demoralizing influence on the army goes much further than that. There has never been a monarch on the throne of Prussia who has been such a spendthrift, nor one so fond of expensive court festivities and lavish personal display, and for him to preach to his young officers strict economy seems a ludicrous paradox. It is notorious, for instance, that the members of his

large military household, including aides-de-camp, are of necessity compelled to spend a great deal of money in order to keep up with the requirements he exacts. Each one of them must, out of his own pocket, provide for a stableful of blooded horses, and other things in proportion. Under his grandfather, whom he claims to pattern after, things in this respect were different.

Thus, morally, the present German army has, assuredly, sadly deteriorated. But that is not all, nor is this the point which most concerns Germany's allies or opponents. The efficiency of the army, too, has seriously suffered. It is not difficult to find the reasons. First, all the trusted and able men that had slowly risen before 1866 are gone. Not one is left. The Kaiser would have none of them remain in active service. He called this "rejuvenating" the army, a process of rapidly weeding out all the battle-scarred and experienced commanders. The process has left none but totally untried men in every post of importance, men neither very able nor at all willing to criticise or to withstand the Kaiser's whimsical innovations. The presence of the paladins of his grandfather, men who had borne the brunt of battle and demonstrated their mettle and their capacity, was irksome to him. The army, indeed, is to-day commanded by an Emperor who knows absolutely nothing of practical warfare from personal experience. The youngest lieutenant in France, Russia, England and the United States knows more of actual fighting than he. He has never as much as witnessed a skirmish, let alone an engagement or a battle, and that means volumes in the case of a German Kaiser, whose title of "Commander-in-Chief" is not nominal, as it is in the case of several other sovereigns, but really means all it seems to mean, viz., the chief and untrammelled command over all the forces of the Empire by land and sea. And the officers serving under him are just as ignorant of real war as he. They are, without exception, men who have grown to manhood since the war with France, thirty-three years ago. The achievements and the teachings of a Moltke or Roon, of the "Red Prince" or of "Unser Fritz," of Blumenthal and all the others among the undaunted band that stood around the modest, plain, taciturn old Emperor William I., are nothing but so much printer's ink to them. Again, both the weapons with which the wars of the future will be fought, and the radical change in tactics and in strategy that must result from the employment of smokeless

powder and long-range guns and rifles, are new elements, untested on a large scale. Has the Kaiser and have his young generals adapted themselves to these changes? I very much fear not.

It is matter of common knowledge that the Kaiser, from his strong love of the spectacular, has taught his army, at every great manœuvre held since his accession in 1888, not to fight as they will have to fight in a future war in order to win, namely, in accordance with the very different tactics made necessary by the general adoption of modern weapons—tactics, it will be remembered, to learn which cost England many thousands of lives and untold millions in money on the veldts and on the kopjes of South Africa. Instead, he has taught them to fight as if the old smooth-bores were still in use. And his generals, his military advisers, and, of course, his subalterns, have supinely acquiesced. His massing of cavalry and his insane cavalry and infantry charges, in serried ranks, up steep hills and over vast territories swept by the enemy's fire for long distances, have been the amazement of all competent judges—of every foreign general witnessing these displays, which are magnificent as purely military spectacles, but far worse than useless as a mimicry of actual war conditions. At the big Fall manœuvres, a couple of years ago, when American officers fresh from the Philippines were present as eye-witnesses, I had it from the lips of one of the latter: "If the Kaiser means to tackle the enemy in that style in the next war, not a man or horse of them will reach their destination." His strategy has been ridiculed in secret by every German officer of ability, and openly by many distinguished foreign ones. The newspapers in Germany, as strongly as they dared, have commented on it in uncomplimentary terms. But there has come no change. For fifteen years, the German army has been taught, in sham battle, to attack an imaginary enemy on conditions and in a manner which would invite complete annihilation in actual warfare.

Next to that stands the gruesome chapter of the abuse of power by officers and non-commissioned officers in the German army exercised toward their subordinates, the rank and file. On February 15th, 1890, the Kaiser issued a cabinet order dealing with this evil. It was addressed to the Minister of War, and said:

"In my army every soldier is to be treated according to law, justly and humanely. Only thus is it possible to inspire him with zeal and devotion to duty, and love and respect for his superiors."

This order had been directly occasioned by the fact that Prince George of Saxony (now the ruling sovereign of that country), in his capacity of military inspector of a large part of the Prussian army, had remarked the prevalence of cruel and brutal treatment of soldiers by their superiors, especially by the subaltern and non-commissioned officers, and had drawn the Kaiser's attention to it. It cannot be said, however, that this particular order, or similar ones since issued by the Kaiser, have eradicated or even diminished this cancer, as many trials and incidents in the recent past have proven. The vicious and debasing custom of officers in cruelly and often brutally maltreating their defenceless subordinates has frequently led to Reichstag interpellations and long-winded discussions. As a rule, shortly after the convening of the national parliament, every late autumn, the topic is brought up by the Liberals and Socialists, sometimes even by supporters of the present government, and each successive Minister of War rises, and defends as best he may the army authorities on that score, invariably promising reform. That was done again last December; the new Minister of War (for, as a rule, the Kaiser changes his men in that office every twelvemonth), General von Einem, admitted that during the past year fifty officers and 577 non-commissioned officers had been convicted and punished for fiendishly abusing their authority. As scarcely one case of such misuse of power in a hundred is brought to the notice of military courts (and this for obvious reasons), these figures are simply appalling. Nearly every day items may be read in the German press like the following, cabled here on December 14th last:

"A thousand specifications of cruelty are made against Lieutenant Schilling, of the Ninety-eighth Regiment of Infantry, whose trial began at Metz to-day. . . ."

Two days later, the same Associated Press correspondent reported a similar case, only worse, wherein a sergeant named Franzki, of the Eighty-Fifth Infantry, figured with 1520 counts of maltreatment, and abuse of authority on 100 counts. These, however, are but ordinary cases. There have been not a few in recent years where conviction was had for tormenting luckless private soldiers to death. And, strange to say—I mean, strange in view of the Kaiser's repeated stringent orders and of the horror

with which he professes to regard such offences — punishment is in nearly all cases mild and curiously inadequate. For practising tortures worse and more ingenious than those practised by Indians here in days of yore, tortures which ended fatally for nine of the men under his charge, one young officer last year received but a six months' sentence of confinement in a fortress, a species of confinement not deemed dishonorable among his class; and, what is still more strange, after serving out a single month of this sentence this fiend was pardoned by Imperial clemency. The effect of such treatment, in these days of world-wide humanitarian effort, on the morale of the German army and on the sentiment of the nation as a whole may be imagined. To get the full bearing of this remark, it must always be kept in mind that active military service is universal and compulsory in Germany, and that this system of baiting and maltreatment is well-nigh the rule in the German army.

Another feature of this whole question, and in some respects the most important of all, must still be touched upon. I refer to the attitude of the army, more especially of the corps of officers, toward the bulk of the nation, the civilian part, the part which supports the whole army out of the proceeds of the heavy taxes wrung from a patient people. That attitude is not paralleled among the other civilized nations of the world. The officer is a demigod in Germany. He is, socially, first. He outshines not only in his own eyes (which would be natural enough), but in those of the whole nation, any other class or body of men, being set up on a pedestal and worshipped by silly maidens and sillier parents. He outranks, in a country where official rank is everything, the brightest galaxy of dignitaries, and leaves the grave and immaculate German professor far, far behind, in the race for popular favor.

That, then, is the way in which the civilian portion of the nation looks upon the military portion—as being unapproachably superior. The natural corollary is, that the officers themselves regard the "mere civilians" as distinctly their inferiors, regard them with contempt as the vulgar herd, much as the Spartans of old regarded the helots. This attitude of mind is, it is undeniable, greatly fostered by the Kaiser and by the whole government class of the Empire, who never tire inculcating the lesson that to "wear the king's coat" is the greatest distinction that can be

conferred on a mortal. On November 15th, 1894, the Kaiser, in addressing a body of recruits for the Guards, said:

". . . Do not forget that you wear the coat of your king. Honor that coat, and keep in mind that you have been deemed worthy to discharge your service before my eyes, and that by entering the army you have become nobles. . . ."

Is, then, the insolent bearing, the more or less acute disdain, with which the officers hold themselves aloof from the common rabble, the every-day, taxpaying yahoo, to be wondered at?

But, indeed, there are other factors tending in the same direction. One of them is the striking difference in the ethical codes governing the conduct of army officers and of the civilian population. One of these differences is to be found in the duel as an institution. Little by little, mortal combat has been eliminated from the German civilian's life as the method of final settlement of questions of honor. But in the army, thanks to the Kaiser, who, like all the Hohenzollerns, has been bred in the belief that the duel is the only satisfactory manner of avenging insults, this remnant of mediæval nonsense has survived. His much-talked-of decree, some years ago, merely sought to still further regulate the army duel by bringing it, in nearly all cases, under the preliminary notice of a "court of honor," so called, meeting *ad hoc*. The number of army duels has slightly decreased, but duelling has gained in respectability by thus being formally sanctioned by the sovereign commander. And there is another point. Besides the 25,000 officers in the active army, there are some 43,000 officers of the "reserve," who, in case of war, would likewise be called to arms and receive commands in the reserve corps. These men, by that very fact, must also adhere throughout life, and in their civilian relations, to every paragraph of the military code of honor, as distinguished from the ordinary civilian one. That leads to very frequent and most unpleasant complications, on which I do not propose to dwell here. The curious fact is thus presented that the Kaiser, being both Commander-in-Chief of the army and civil chief of the whole nation, not only encourages but renders obligatory, in certain contingencies, the breaking of the laws which he has sworn to uphold. What is more, he unfailingly pardons both challenger and challenged of a duelling party after they have served a small share of their ludicrously

lenient sentence, a sentence which, even in instances where one or the other of the offenders has been killed, seldom exceeds a few months of honorable retirement in a military fort.

The peculiar code of the officers, and their whole mental attitude towards civilians, lead frequently to such tragedies as the one in which Lieutenant von Brüsewitz played an unenviable part a few years ago; or like the one in which a young naval lieutenant, recently, slaughtered in cold blood an old schoolmate and fellow townsman for no worse offence than what he considered a too familiar form of salute. There are many other features equally strange and unpleasant growing out of this broad cleavage, in sentiment and standards, between the professional soldier element and the remaining overwhelmingly larger bulk of the people; but enough has been shown to suggest a state of affairs in Germany which cannot fail to work untold mischief.

The German army, then, judged by every rule that governs modern life, is in a bad way. But quite a large percentage of the ills it suffers from are curable. If the Kaiser showed in this matter a tithe of the energy and common sense that distinguish him in some other respects, he could achieve much good in ameliorating, or perhaps in utterly reforming, these conditions. Unfortunately, the Kaiser is, though in some respects progressive enough, in others a thorough-paced reactionary. There is no sign of an intention on his part to grapple in earnest with the crying evils which have been painted, but rather the reverse. His earlier ardor for army reforms has cooled. The pardons and remissions he so frequently grants to even the worst offenders, to the Brüsewitzes and their ilk, augur ill for the future. It is to be feared that some day there will be a rude awakening for Germany; for his son, the young Crown-Prince, has also been carefully nurtured in these false traditions and in wrong ideals of the past. Will it require another Jena to restore that robustness of moral fibre to the German army which was probably the most important factor that led it on from victory to victory in the gigantic struggle with France a generation ago?

WOLF VON SCHIERBRAND.

THE TRANSVAAL—AFTER THE WAR.

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL F. G. STONE, R.A., LATELY RESIDENT MAGISTRATE AND CIVIL COMMISSIONER IN THE TRANSVAAL.

DEFINITIONS are to be deprecated; but, nevertheless, it is desirable for a clear understanding of the deeply interesting problems which have called and are calling for solution in the Transvaal, since the termination of the late war, that the broad political features which characterize the three South-African colonies should be recognized.

Cape Colony, the oldest of the British South-African Colonies, has for many years been a self-governing Colony; political power has been pretty equally divided between British and Dutch, notwithstanding the preponderance of capital, enterprise, and population on the part of the British. This is rendered possible by the splendid organization of the Dutch political machine known as the "Bond," and the extraordinary distribution of parliamentary seats among the constituencies, which enables one Dutch farmer to wield the same influence at the polls as a dozen British storekeepers or professional men resident in the towns.

The conspiracy to "drive the English into the sea," which culminated in the invasion of Natal by the combined forces of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, was developed into vertebrate existence by the "Bond," and the conspirators and their friends in Cape Colony became in many cases rebels in arms against their own Government, in other cases contenting themselves with pulling the wires, assisting the enemy or opposing British interests in secret.

Martial law was, obviously, the only means of dealing with such a situation; and, no matter how leniently and justly that law was administered, it is clear that the relations between the loyal citizens and rebels could not be expected to be harmonious

at the termination of the war. So far, indeed, were their relations from being harmonious, that, after the restraining influence of martial law had been removed, the loyal Dutch were openly and cruelly boycotted by the late rebels and their sympathizers in localities where the latter were predominant.

The recent General Election at the Cape gave a small majority to the "Progressive" party and against the "Bond," and this has proved sufficient to carry a bill for a more equitable distribution of seats. The "Progressive" majority at the next General Election should be increased sufficiently to give a stable government to the Colony for some years to come.

Lord Milner is the best hated man in Cape Colony by the "Bond" party, and for the best of reasons—he exposed their methods. A carefully organized campaign has been started with a view to undermining his influence; and it is pitiful even at the present day to hear the absurd charges which are brought against him, by persons who from their birth and education ought to be better informed, but who have allowed their judgment to be warped and their eyes blinded by insidious misstatements or the vulgar invective of a hostile party press.

Such is Cape Colony to-day, a country divided against itself, teeming with bitter animosities, disappointed ambitions and religious persecution. I know men who have been excommunicated by the Dutch Church for no worse offence than loyalty to their own Government, and I know others whose lives have been made so unbearable that they have sold off everything, at a heavy sacrifice, and started life anew in the Transvaal.

Natal before the war was essentially British, and is so still; no race problems trouble its political life; its loyalty to the Empire has never been in question, and there is no place for the schemes of "Bond" agitators.

The Orange River Colony, known before the war as the Orange Free State, was dragged into the war very much against the wishes of a very large proportion, if not of the majority, of the inhabitants. For some generations, British and Dutch had lived there side by side, and intermarried. No political question of any importance had strained the good relations which existed between the Free State and the British Government; British officials were to be found in Government appointments; and nothing could have been more cordial than the sentiments existing

between the two nationalities. President Brand was beloved and respected by British and Dutch alike; his successor, President Steyn, did not command quite the same sentiments, as it was clear, especially in the latter days, that he was more of a politician playing for his own hand than a statesman thinking only of the welfare of his country. His alliance with the Transvaal was the first overt act which showed his hand, and which raised the curtain on the terrible drama of national suicide upon which he embarked his country to gratify his personal ambition, that ambition being nothing less than to obtain the reversion of the Presidency of a United South Africa, upon Paul Krüger's death.

I was informed by a member of the Free State Raad that, when Steyn summoned a meeting to decide on the question of whether, in the event of war between Great Britain and the Transvaal, the Free State should join forces with the latter, the majority of the members had quite made up their minds to vote in the negative, but they were so completely carried away by Steyn's impassioned eloquence that, against their better judgment, they voted almost unanimously in favor of throwing in their lot with the Transvaal.

The Transvaal was by no means in favor of war by a large majority; it is in fact doubtful whether the poll of the districts which Paul Krüger took on the question, actually produced a majority at all. The most enlightened men in the Transvaal did all they could to prevent Krüger from undertaking the disastrous adventure of a war with Great Britain. The Transvaal, however, had to accept the dictum of its Government; and, once war was declared, every burgher, whether he liked it or not, had to go into the field against Great Britain. Once committed to it, the Transvaalers fought against us with the same determination as the Free-Staters, and, be it said to their credit, they fought a fair and honorable fight.

It was most noticeable throughout the war that there was a complete absence of personal animus between the opposing forces on both sides. This, of course, does not apply to the Cape Colony rebels, who, living under the protection of our Government, were taking every opportunity of giving us a stab in the dark, or openly deserting their allegiance to strengthen the ranks of our enemies, and thus unnecessarily prolong a disastrous war which could only bring greater ruin the longer it was dragged out.

After the conclusion of peace, it was interesting to compare

notes with the Boers whom one had previously met in the field, and to fight our battles over again in friendly discussion, without a trace of ill feeling. The war taught both sides to respect one another; and, when the lies which were circulated during the earlier phases of the war were dissipated, and repeated personal contact had caused us to know each other better, it was remarkable what a friendly feeling began to spring up in many quarters between those who were still fighting against each other in the field with the utmost tenacity and determination; on the one hand to bring things to a finish, and on the other never to give in as long as there was a round of ammunition left.

The destruction of the farms throughout a large area in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony was a military necessity; so long as the farms remained intact, each one formed a depot for supplies and even for ammunition, as well as a tactical "*point d'appui*" for the Boers.

Before a farm was destroyed, the residents were removed to the nearest Burgher Camp, or Refugee Camp. This procedure had to be adopted in the case of friends and foes alike. The farms of those who were favorable to us, or who surrendered under Lord Roberts's proclamation, were indeed generally destroyed by the Boers; but all had to be sheltered and provided for in our Burgher or Refugee Camps. These camps were scattered all over South Africa, and were remarkably well organized and managed, notwithstanding the hysterical denunciations of Miss Hobhouse.

Many of the poorer class of Boers were lodged and fed in greater comfort and plenty than they had been accustomed to, and many of our own countrywomen who had been accustomed to a much higher standard of comfort, cheerfully made the best of the inevitable, having lost nearly all they had by the war, and being only too thankful for a refuge where, at all events, the decencies of life were preserved, and the necessaries of life supplied free of cost. Excellent schools were started at all these camps, and it is permissible to hope that the instruction given to the children in cleanliness, decency, order and general knowledge, has not been thrown away. Amusements, in the shape of concerts, dances, lawn-tennis, football, etc., were sufficient for all except the most determined grumblers, and the majority of the young Boers of both sexes undoubtedly had a "better time" than they had ever been accustomed to or will ever have again. I re-

member calling at a very isolated farm in the Standerton District, after the war, which was occupied by a widow and her daughter. I asked the girl whether she did not find it rather lonely at times, and she replied, with obvious sincerity: "Oh, I should like to be back in the camp at ——; we did have a good time there."

To those of us who served through the war, and remained for a while in the country after the war, and were in intimate touch with the life of the camps from start to finish, it seems a work of supererogation to defend the administration of the camps. It needs no defence.

I have frequently discussed the policy of establishing these camps with Boer ex-Generals and Commandants, and they condemned the policy from the military point of view, arguing that we would have brought the war to a conclusion with much less trouble and expense if we had removed everything from the farms *except the residents.* In other words, if we had deprived the women and children of the means of subsistence, their fathers, husbands, and brothers would have had to throw up the sponge.

The Boers in the field were at first ready to believe all the lies they heard about the camps. These lies came from various sources, not the least important being the deliberate inventions of some of the more bitter and irreconcilable among the women, who would stick at nothing to inflame the minds of their men folk against us.

The camps formed valuable depots at the conclusion of the war, for the purpose of repatriating the prisoners of war, their families, and other refugees.

The war was brought to a conclusion at a time when our resources in men, horses, equipment and supplies were at the zenith. Disappointment was felt among the troops that the Boers should be allowed to make any terms, when three months more campaigning, during a winter of extraordinary severity, must have brought them to their knees.

The terms of surrender made provision for the repatriation of prisoners and refugees, and for the payment of a sum of £3,000,000 to give those who had suffered in the war a fair start in life.

This grant of £3,000,000 was in no sense intended to be paid out *pro rata* as compensation for damage to property, although claims for compensation were allowed to be filed, and sworn testimony taken thereon, with a view to ascertaining the actual cir-

cumstances of the claimants, as a guide to the assistance which they should receive.

The state of the country varied considerably in different districts; but where most of the fighting had occurred, it was an absolute waste. Thus, in the Standerton District, there was an area of between 4,000 and 5,000 square miles, including the town of Bethal, without a single house left standing or a living animal or human being remaining—except in the town of Standerton, which had been continuously occupied by our troops since the arrival of Sir Redvers Buller.

It is almost impossible for any one to conceive the magnitude of the problem in bulk, and the difficulties to be encountered in detail, which faced the British Government and the Colonial Administration. The Transvaal had become a Crown Colony, and the machinery of government was rapidly constructed, a beginning having been made from the time when we occupied Pretoria and Johannesburg and other important towns.

Resident Magistrates were appointed in every District with functions of District Commissioners, Assistant Magistrates being appointed to carry on the routine work of the Magistrate's Court in regard to the bulk of the strictly magisterial duties.

The first step to be taken was the formation of the Repatriation Depots, with a strong staff, and the collection in these depots of food, seed, agricultural implements, transport, animals for ploughing, and stone and building material. Concurrently with this, the prisoners of war were being brought back to the various South-African ports, and gradually drafted up country as the means for providing for their wants accummulated at the various depots. The families of the prisoners, who were in the different Burgher Camps, were brought up at the same time by a regular system of drafts, and distributed to their farms. Every family was supplied with tents and a month's rations to commence with, and the necessary equipment for starting life again was supplied as rapidly as it was possible to obtain it from the coast and elsewhere. Rations were continued for many months, and in necessitous cases for over a year. The difficulty and expense of distribution were naturally enormous.

At the conclusion of the war, most of the rail transport was still required by the military, and it was a long time before any noticeable relief in this respect was afforded to the civil population.

This was due to the fact that reductions in foodstuffs and material of war required by the Field Army, were offset by increases under the head of building material for barracks. At no time was the congestion of traffic felt so acutely as during the first three months after the conclusion of peace. Transport for civil supplies had to be carefully parcelled out; and large districts, including their capital towns, such as Standerton, were compelled to depend on a total of forty tons a month for *everything,* from furniture to whiskey, from wearing apparel to bread and meat, from building material to soap. It was a case of living from hand to mouth, at a time when exceptional facilities for development were required. Artisans were standing idle in the face of urgently required works, and builders living on credit when they could command fabulous wages for exercising their trade, if only the materials could be brought to the spot.

The distribution of goods after they reached the railway station presented an equal difficulty. There is no grazing worth mentioning in the greater part of the Transvaal from June to October, and consequently no feed for transport animals; these could only be fed by imported supplies, and at first it was an impossibility to import supplies.

However, these difficulties were gradually overcome, and the conditions of life became less precarious.

The Transvaal Dutch law was fairly comprehensive, and very simple and clear. Fortunately, it had been very carefully translated into English during the war, and thus the newly appointed officials had no difficulty in carrying on the business of the courts. Gradually, some of the old laws which had ceased to be applicable were cancelled; and, at the same time, new laws affecting a vast number of subjects were promulgated, almost more rapidly than they could be digested by the hard-worked officials who were trying their best to do everything at the same time, at a period when everything claimed urgency.

Almost immediately after the conclusion of the war, the Resident Magistrate in each District submitted, to His Excellency the Governor, the names of three persons for appointment to the Commission, of which the Magistrate was *ex-officio* chairman. One of these was a representative of the "early surrenders," who came in under Lord Roberts's proclamation shortly after the occupation of Prètoria by the British; one was a representative of the

"late surrenders," who remained in the field until the end; and one was purely British, either a Colonist, or a British subject having considerable Colonial experience. The Commissioners had two distinct functions to perform; the first being the investigation of all cases requiring immediate assistance, and the issuing of the necessary order on the Repatriation Depot for rations, seeds, agricultural implements, transport, animals for ploughing, etc.; the second function being the investigation of actual losses sustained during the war.

As regards the first, a grant in kind up to a moderate amount was made in all cases which required it, without reference to the ability of the recipient to repay it. A debtor and creditor account was, however, kept in every case, and the debit was ultimately written off against the compensation granted, provided that there was sufficient to meet it, or wiped out altogether if there were no assets available. Stock, building material in excess of bare necessaries, farming implements, fencing, etc., could all be obtained on credit, no interest being charged; even cash advances up to £200 could be obtained on similarly easy terms, without interest, the only security required being the endorsement of the promissory notes by a landowner. Larger sums could be obtained by mortgage at the low rate of four per cent. interest, the market rate being from six to ten per cent.

In every case the people had to be rationed for from three to nine months after returning to their farms, whether they were able to pay for the rations or not, and the business of putting them back on their farms, rationing them, and assisting them in rebuilding their homesteads and cultivating the land, was a very heavy responsibility. Every family was provided with the necessary tents to start with, as a free gift.

Compensation claims were dealt with under five heads.

1. *Claims of "late surrenders" for a share in the £3,000,000 granted under the terms of surrender.* These were assessed by the Commission, and an award recommended according to the nature of the case. This fund was intended to enable every one to start in life again, and in no sense to compensate every one in proportion to the actual losses sustained.

2. *Claims of "early surrenders" under Lord Roberts's proclamation.* These were assessed and an award recommended by the chairman (Resident Magistrate), assisted by a military officer:

these were *bona fide* compensation claims which were paid out proportionately to the actual loss sustained, to the extent permitted by the funds available. The sums claimed were naturally enormous, and far in excess of what any nation could pay under the circumstances. All that the British military authorities were willing to accept liability for, was loss or damage to property actually within the area of possible British protection, and fixed property outside that area.

3. *Claims of British subjects.* These were dealt with solely by the Resident Magistrate, and his award, after approval or amendment in Pretoria, was actually paid out by instalments to the full amount awarded.

4. *Foreign claims.* These were investigated by the Resident Magistrate, and passed on by him, after taking evidence, to an official at Johannesburg, who, after consulting the consul of the Power concerned, would make the award.

5. *Native claims.* These were dealt with by the Commissioners for Native Affairs, and were exceedingly difficult to assess, owing to the impossibility of obtaining reliable evidence, and the difficulty of identification.

As a rough guide to the work generally carried out, the following figures, for the Standerton District only, will be of interest.

Within six months after the conclusion of the war, 20,000 souls were replaced on their farms: and, within fifteen months, 2,500 claims for compensation had been heard and adjudicated upon. This necessitated an actual tour of the District, and in the case of the "early surrenders," and the British and foreign claimants, an actual assessment on the spot of damage done.

The foregoing is typical of what had to be done throughout the country, though naturally in some districts, where the damage was not so heavy, the work was lighter than in others.

Among those who surrendered before the end of the war were the "National Scouts." These were Boers who took up arms on the side of the British after the commencement of the guerilla stage of the war, when no possibility of success remained to the Boers. Some of them were impelled to this course by the desire to save their country from further ruin at the hands of the obstinate guerilla leaders, who were uselessly prolonging an embittered struggle in a cause already lost; others were actuated by no other motive than the desire to draw good pay and rations.

The feeling on the part of the Boers generally was very strong against the National Scouts, and the ministers of the Dutch Church for a long time practically excommunicated them. By degrees, however, this bitter feeling subsided, and the ministers of religion received them back into the fold when they found that the National Scouts were ready to secede from the Dutch Reformed Church and form a sect of their own.

Settlements were established on cooperative principles for the benefit of the more impecunious National Scouts, into which were also admitted any other suitable persons, irrespective of politics, provided they were willing to work.

One of the first cares of the Government, after the conclusion of the war, was to make provision for schools all over the country, as well as in the towns; the nucleus already existed in the schools which had been established in all the Burgher Camps, under British teachers. In that part of the country where the effects of the war had been most severely felt—viz., Standerton, Ermelo, and part of Heidelberg and Middlesburg and Wakkerstrom—the difficulty in starting the farm-schools was very great. It must be remembered that, over an area of many thousands of square miles, there was not a single building standing intact. Formerly, the schools (where they existed) had been usually in buildings lent by farmers for the purpose, teachers could readily be boarded and lodged, and pupils from a distance could also be accommodated in the same manner at neighboring farms, returning to their homes for the "week end." The conditions that had to be faced after the war were, however, quite different, and teachers had to go out and establish their schools on the bare veldt at any point where they were required and approved. The hardships which the teachers of both sexes had to put up with are not among the least of the contributions which Great Britain has made toward establishing a good understanding with our late foes.

The teaching in the schools is given in English, a small amount of instruction in Dutch being given also daily, and religious instruction in Dutch, if desired. As a matter of fact, the parents are not in the least anxious about Dutch being taught in the schools. The "Taal," or Cape Dutch, is a hybrid dialect, varying considerably in different parts of the country, and has comparatively little in common with the High Dutch spoken in Holland. The "Taal" does not need to be taught to children who speak it

in their own homes, and the High Dutch is more difficult for a Boer to learn than English; it is, indeed, remarkable with what facility the Boers, especially the children, learn English, and how very pure their accent is. I have never heard any foreigner, except a Swede, speak English with such a pure accent as a Transvaal Boer. Whatever agitation there has been with regard to teaching more Dutch in the schools has been largely fictitious; the politicians and the predikants (ministers) have been the moving spirits in the agitation; there has been no spontaneous revolt against the English language as the medium of instruction, among the bulk of the people affected.

The principal difficulty in the resettlement of the country after the war, was the scarcity of labor. This was felt most acutely by new settlers, and by the more energetic Boers; such Kaffirs as there were, preferring to work (?) for an old-fashioned, easy-going Boer, who would not expect great things from his land, and would not take the trouble to see that he got an adequate return from the labor employed. The wages which had to be paid to induce a Kaffir to work were simply preposterous, two pounds a month and food, or three pounds a month without food, being the common tariff. The farming industry, the mines, trades, business, and domestic service, all suffered equally. Public works for the general benefit of the community were either carried on at a ruinous cost or, for the time being, abandoned. The causes of this deficiency in labor were twofold; many of the Kaffirs had made enough during the war to live in idleness; the money saved being invested in wives, who are the natural slaves of their lords and save them from any of the unpleasantness and discomfort attendant on hard work. The "dignity of labor" is a phrase not understood by the Kaffir, and indeed imperfectly appreciated by the Boer; the dignity of idleness is, however, thoroughly comprehended, and there is a quite sufficiently large "leisured class" among the Kaffirs to form a hereditary aristocracy.

The other cause of this scarcity of labor is the enormous demand, in excess of the requirements before the war, due to the rehabilitation of a country laid waste by war, and the impetus given in all directions to trade, industries and public works by the influx of British enterprise and capital.

The appreciation of the fact that imported labor was the only solution to this pressing economic problem, grew rapidly. The

Boers on the farms very soon realized that imported labor for the mines meant the setting free of Kaffir labor for the land, and that the prosperity of the mines meant markets for their agricultural produce, payments in cash, and ability to restock their farms with the proceeds; and, after the lapse of a few years, the power to supply the South-African market with meat as well as with agricultural produce.

The Colonial storekeepers, who at first strongly opposed the imported labor, fearing competition in their own business, also gradually came to see things in a different light, as they sat idle in their stores waiting for customers who never came, and read the draft ordinance which was carefully framed to prevent any possible evil results, such as they feared, from following on the heels of the imported Celestial.

Even the fanatical "White League," which was supposed to represent the interest of the white working-man and trader, began to lose adherents and sink into insignificance, when its followers began to reason for themselves, and to discover that the kind of work which the white man was willing to perform could only be created by colored labor performing the unskilled drudgery.

The advocates of "cheap white labor" for the mines found little support in the Transvaal, where the conditions of life were better understood than in England. Cheap white labor for the mines would, perhaps, have been the most disastrous expedient that could have been tried; it would have meant the submersion of the white laborer in the social scale, his moral and physical deterioration, and intermarriage with Kaffirs.

The most stubborn opponents of imported labor were the Boer political party, headed by the ex-Generals Louis Botha and Smuts, and the irreconcilable Moderator of the Dutch Reformed Church, Bosman. Their argument was that such an important step should not be taken without an unmistakable mandate from the country, and that, therefore, it ought to be postponed until representative government was given to the Colony. If this argument had been allowed to gain the day, and it seemed plausible enough, the consequences would have been the starving of British enterprise and the acceleration of the grant of representative government, with the result that the first elections would be held before there could be anything like the overwhelming British majority

in the country which prosperous economic conditions were certain to produce—in other words, it is permissible to believe that they hoped for a "Bond" majority at the polls.

The first consignment of Chinese is, however, now on its way to the Transvaal, and those who know what can be done with Chinese labor, under proper legislation, are filled with the most sanguine expectations for the future prosperity of this rich but sorely tried country.

The government of the larger towns was carried out, after the war, by "appointed" Municipalities or Health Boards; these, except in the case of Pretoria and Johannesburg, were presided over by the Resident Magistrate. They had no power to levy rates, except the sanitary rates, and their functions were necessarily limited. After an existence of fifteen months, steps were taken and powers given for the introduction of representative municipal government in all the larger towns. The preparations for the first elections were carefully made to insure absolutely fair election of the real representatives of the people; property valuation was made, and voters' lists prepared, registration papers sent out to all who were entitled to vote, and the procedure carefully explained in both Dutch and English. At first, many of the poorer classes of Dutch were very shy about filling in the registration papers, asserting that it was only a dodge of the British Government to enroll them for active service.

The absolute equality with which Dutch and English were treated in all respects, was an enigma to many of the suspicious ex-Burghers, and nothing would convince them of the honesty of our intentions. Sincerity is not one of the traits of the Boer character, as a rule; and it is, therefore, not wonderful that they should regard our well-meant efforts with a certain amount of aloofness and suspicion. We cannot expect them suddenly to drop the traditions and habits of thought of many generations, simply because we hold out the hand of good-fellowship and equality to them. Time alone will prove and is proving to them that we have no sinister designs, and those among them who are guided by their own common sense and observation, instead of being led away by short-sighted or interested politicians, are already beginning to realize that British rule is not as black as it has been painted.

F. G. Stone.

DEMOCRATIC EXPANSION.

BY HORATIO W. SEYMOUR.

THE question whether the Philippine Islands were to be American territory or not was settled, probably for all time, when, by the votes of Democrats as well as of Republicans, the Treaty of Paris was ratified by the Senate. There is only one party issue now, and it may be expressed with considerable clearness in these words: Shall we adopt as a settled policy the British system of crown colonies in defiance of precedent, or shall we preserve and strengthen the American system of expansion under which the Republic became great and prosperous?

This is a question, practically ignored thus far by Democrats individually and collectively, which the National Convention soon to be held at St. Louis might profitably take into consideration. In the Democratic platforms and speeches which have gained attention during the last five years, generalizations on the subject of Imperialism and frank declarations in favor of a scuttle have been freely indulged in, as if there were no alternative. In no case has any man or any group of men proposed that the Government should assume toward the remote possessions of the United States the attitude which it held without variation toward all of its acquisitions preceding the war with Spain. Confusion, arising from a denunciation of Imperialism and from suggestions of an impossible surrender in the Philippines, has obscured what would appear to be a fundamental Democratic principle, viz., that democratic-republican government should and must follow the flag. From a Democratic standpoint any other policy would appear to be inadmissible. Imperialism is not to be thought of. Withdrawal from the Philippines on any terms is not to be thought of. The islands are ours, and they are not to be given up, and they are not to be governed as by a despot. Without

reference to their distance from the mainland or to the barbarism of a large portion of their population, they are entitled to every guaranty of freedom which Americans enjoy at home.

We are face to face with a danger often predicted and, in some matters of minor importance, perhaps, actually presented—that the Constitution will be amended by the judgment of a court instead of by the orderly processes provided by law. A change of opinion by one member of the Supreme Court would have engrafted upon the Constitution an amendment more far-reaching in its consequences than any that resulted from the Civil War. With one recruit on that bench for absolutism, when the insular cases were decided, it is probable that no man now living would have seen the day when the Philippines could be more than a royal demesne, a field for selfish exploitation by favored interests, a safe retreat for political adventurers, a graveyard for American soldiers, and a dumping-place for American treasure. With one recruit for absolutism on that bench, powers would have been conferred upon the President which have no parallel outside of Russia and China. The supremacy of Congress, that is, of the people, over newly acquired territory, unquestioned for more than a century, was affirmed by the Supreme Court in these cases by a division of five to four.

The question of government for the Philippines concerns Americans quite as much as it does the natives of those islands. Are the United States to maintain anywhere on this planet a government under which no honest American would risk his life, liberty and property? How are these islands to be developed and made of use to the Republic, to the world and to civilization? What security are enterprise and capital to have there? Is labor to have its just reward, and are the weak to be safeguarded as against the strong?

There can be no future for the Philippines which any American can contemplate with pride, or in which any American not favored by some political or military ring can hope to profit, which is not hedged about on every hand by the Constitution and the laws. The danger narrowly escaped in the Supreme Court is not removed by any means. It is still within the power of ambitious men, working upon the ignorance or prejudices of a subservient Congress, to provide by legislative methods for an unlimited prolongation of the very conditions which the Court,

so far as the President is concerned, has solemnly condemned. The Democratic opportunity is to be found in this situation. With some necessary modifications, it is the British colonial system and not the American system of expansion which we are invited by the Administration to support in the Philippines.

In its origin the British system was an imperial measure for the extension of commerce, and nothing more. The government used the resources of the people to promote the business interests of a class. It carried on wars, in which the lives and treasure of the Empire were freely sacrificed, for the benefit of trade. It gave to favored individuals and companies chartered rights to plunder and ravage in its name.

Lord Grenville summarized with great frankness the British idea of a colonial empire in the eighteenth century when he said: "Colonies are only settlements in distant parts of the world for the improvement of trade." The incapacity of King, ministers and Parliament to rise above this sordid view in the case of the American colonies, cost the Empire its fairest possessions, and taught most of its statesmen a lesson from which, in some quarters of the world, the British government has profited materially.

It is noteworthy, for example, that in Canada and Australasia the British, discarding their own policy and imitating the principles of expansion which characterized the great Republic for more than a century, have established self-governing provinces, which lack independence only in name. The colonial policy which we have asserted in the Philippines is the system of the British commercial classes, as bluntly interpreted by Grenville. It has been fastened upon the Republic at a time when the successors of the British authors of the idea are abandoning it and safeguarding the Empire by following the original American plan. The British of to-day are profiting by the wisdom of our ancestors, which we are ignoring or repudiating.

In the course of the remarks above referred to on the subject of British colonization, Lord Grenville said that the system would be intolerable and not to be considered for an instant except on the lines of exploitation which he had indicated. More than one of the controlling statesmen at Washington have declared that, if the Constitution and the laws must necessarily follow the flag into the Philippines, "we cannot get out of there too soon."

Wherever the original British system of colonization still obtains without modification, it is supported by force at great expense. Wars are frequent, and the Empire is weakened thereby. Wherever the British Empire has any reason to believe that it has strength in men and money, it will be found that the American system of expansion has been adopted. The difference is that which always is found between tyranny and strife on one side and justice and peace on the other.

This broken-down British system it is now sought to establish under the protection of the American flag. No good can come of the attempt abroad or at home. If we shall adhere to it, we shall err with knowledge, with eyes wide open to an experience which we of all people should profit by, and with a certainty that, sooner or later, when confronted by disaster and disgrace, we shall be compelled in sorrow to retrace our steps.

If there is to be a Democratic measure for the government of the Philippines, its authors will find in the ordinance of 1787 the principles which governed the Democratic party through all the years during which that organization guided the continental development of the Republic. This ordinance providing for the government of the Northwest Territory was the first American essay in expansion. The remarkable gifts of that generation of Americans were not shown more clearly in any other matter than they were in this. The Constitution itself, which came a little later—for it is to be remembered that the ordinance was the work of the old Federation and not of the United States—was not in any one respect more notable.

Under the Articles of Confederation, which were superseded by the Constitution, no authority was conferred upon the Continental Congress to acquire or to govern new territory. That power was assumed not by the president of that body, but by the body itself. The ordinance which it adopted provided for the institution of a provisional government under the control of Congress. The governor and judges were to be appointed by Congress. The governor and his council were authorized to legislate subject to the veto of Congress. Elections for a Territorial Assembly were provided for, and, when certain conditions were fulfilled, organization and representation in Congress as a Territory were guaranteed.

More important than all these, however, it was decreed that

the Territory should be dedicated to free institutions, that there should be no slavery, that liberty of conscience should prevail, that education should be fostered, that rights of property should be respected, that nothing should be done therein to impair the obligations of contracts and that commerce should be free forever. On these lines, every one of the five noble States which ultimately were created out of the wilderness wrote its bill of rights and attached it as a preamble to its Constitution.

A few months later, when the Constitution was drawn and the federal government was established, the only change that it was found necessary to make in the ordinance was to bring it into line with the Constitution in the matter of the appointment of officers in the Territory. Thereafter, instead of being named by Congress, they were appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Constitution expressly conferred upon Congress the power to make all needful regulations for the control of the Territories of the United States, and it is this authority, sanctioned by the precedents of more than one hundred years, which the Court, by a majority of only one, vindicated in the insular cases.

With these guaranties, the Northwest Territory did not become a field for exploitation by adventurers hanging on the favor of those temporarily in power at the seat of government; on the contrary, it became a wonderful theatre for the display of all those heroic qualities which have made the American pioneer notable throughout the world. Immigration began to flow spontaneously, and swept in mighty tides through the forests and on to the very limits of American possession, where it paused for a time, eager to resume its westward course. It subdued the wilderness, created States, established industries, laid broad and deep the foundations of religion and education, and developed a society which, for vigor and for virtue, was and is second to no other in the world.

It need not be imagined that all this would have been possible under such a government as that which is proposed for the Philippines, which is essentially autocratic, which certainly cannot appeal to freemen and holds out but a feeble hope even to the native. It would not. Free institutions attract freemen, just as autocratic institutions attract and develop favorites, adventurers and slaves. If it be urged that the government of the

Northwest Territory was autocratic at the beginning, it is to be said that, even under the sway of the earlier governors, it enjoyed all of the guaranties above enumerated, and that there never was a time when official authority was not strictly limited by these considerations. There is a striking difference between a governor exercising limited powers and one acting, as has been the case in the Philippines, under little restraint and without a pledge of any sort as to the future.

The American system of expansion, as foreshadowed by the ordinance of 1787, was a radical departure from the British system, with which its authors were very familiar. At that stage of American development, there was little disposition on the part of men conspicuous in public affairs on this continent to follow slavishly the imperial fashions of the Old World. Then, as now, these models had their admirers and defenders; but, thanks to the intelligence and patriotism of the early Democrats, they did not prevail.

Following the august example of the ordinance of 1787 as to American expansion, from that day until the idea of maintaining dependencies after the British fashion was adopted by the Administration at Washington, there was no question by a considerable number of Americans as to the methods or the purpose of expansion. Territorial growth was to be the growth of the Republic. The growth of the Republic was of necessity to contemplate in due time, as Congress should direct, the establishment of self-governing Territories and States, all under the beneficent sway of the Constitution and the laws.

If the Philippines were not acquired for the purpose of creating American Territories and States, what was the purpose? For the first time in our history, the Treaty of Paris extended American sovereignty over new territory without a promise of citizenship for anybody. It is reasonably clear, therefore, that the Administration which negotiated that treaty contemplated a new departure in the way of colonization. By high-sounding declarations of a desire to confer great benefits upon the natives of the islands, the purpose to enlist the American people in a new and dangerous adventure beyond the seas was pretty well concealed.

Every annexation preceding that which resulted from the late war with Spain was followed speedily by action in Congress extending the Constitution and the laws over the lands thus ac-

quired. The humblest American did not hesitate to follow the Constitution and the laws. There was no attempt at monopoly and favoritism. There was no despotism to deprive pioneers of equal opportunities, and there was a guaranty of self-government and citizenship for the future which they knew would be observed. In the Philippines, no such conditions prevail. Natives and American citizens are alike in the dark as to the Government's intentions, and they are alike oppressed by an autocracy which, unless appearances are deceitful, is better calculated to promote selfish interests than to confer advantages and opportunities upon the American people as a whole. The Philippines will be closed to the average American so long as they are held as alien territory, with no promise by either political party in this country that they are not soon to be abandoned.

Subject only to the Constitution, the power of Congress over the Philippines, as over every other Territory of the United States, is supreme. In the days of Democratic ascendency, this power was used to promote the general welfare. The Northwest Territory, Louisiana, Florida, Oregon and the Mexican cession speedily passed through the stage of appurtenant territory and became organized Territories of the United States, with a prospect of Statehood. Then, as now, there were Americans who declaimed against the policy of incorporating wildernesses and savages into our system, but they were not Democrats. Then, as now, there were Americans who favored retreat, abandonment and withdrawal within our ancient borders, but they were not Democrats.

Probably no one will assert that the development of the Republic would have been possible if, acting upon the apprehension of people in the Eastern States who could see nothing in annexation but the absorption of an alien population differing in manners, laws and customs, no provision had been made for a voting citizenship confined to those who were duly qualified. It was not the fact that everybody could vote which brought immigration to the new country, but the vastly more important and more valuable fact that its government guaranteed freedom and justice, and provided for their maintenance by opening the ballot-box to those who were qualified. It is a pledge like this which is needed in the Philippines to-day.

Even if we accept the lowest possible estimate as to the number of people in the Island of Luzon who are qualified to exercise the

suffrage, we will find that they constitute a larger body of voters than appeared at the first elections in most of the new States in America. Five thousand white men was the number provided for in the ordinance of 1787 as necessary to the establishment of representative government in the Northwest Territory. A mere handful of men who were believed to be in touch with civilization and devotedly attached to American principles of government sufficed, in most of our Western States, to adopt constitutions which have since been obeyed by contented millions, and to establish laws which are even now in force.

Not a little of the opposition to the idea of establishing genuine Americanism in the Philippine Archipelago, is due more to the knowledge that American immigration will follow quickly upon the introduction of free institutions in that quarter, than it is to a disregard for the rights of the intelligent native population. If the few are to monopolize the opportunities which the new country affords, the work must be done while autocratic government obtains. With the American Constitution and laws in force in the islands, supported by representative assemblies chosen under a restricted suffrage, it would not be long before there would be voting precincts in that section of the Republic which would be as truly American as thousands that might be named in this country. If there is to be no popular government and no responsibility, such Americans as will be found there will be of the adventurer type, lawless and law-defying.

For these reasons, there should be no disposition in any influential circle to heed the doubts so freely expressed as to the capacity of the native population for self-government. There are people in Luzon, at any rate, who are qualified to vote. There are more of them than there were of the same class in the Northwest Territory and Louisiana when the Constitution and the laws were extended over them. On the other hand, there is not one American there or elsewhere who is qualified to govern without law and without responsibility.

Instead of heeding the emotional gentlemen who favor an ignoble surrender of territories bought with American blood and treasure, why should not Democrats reassert their historic faith, and declare in favor of a genuinely Democratic policy for the government and development of lands which are destined some time to reach the full stature of American Territories, and per-

haps ultimately to become States enjoying all the rights and privileges belonging to the older members of the Union?

Such freedom as the American citizen enjoys is all that the Filipino can ask. We have not offered him this freedom. On the contrary, there is nothing in the policy of the Administration to justify the belief that he is to escape despotic rule. This being the case, what wiser policy can the Democratic party adopt than to declare, in unequivocal terms, its purpose, if entrusted with power, to extend democratic Territorial government, as speedily as possible, over every foot of soil belonging to the United States? This is due to the untutored native of the islands of the sea, as well as to the American citizen and taxpayer, but it is due first of all to the American citizen and taxpayer in whose interest, in the first instance, expansion should be promoted.

This is Democratic expansion as it was known in the past. It is not a pharisaical tyranny. It is not a contemptible surrender and scuttle. It is for Americans primarily, and for uncivilized and savage races only incidentally. It contemplates the creation of self-governing Territories and, possibly, States. It deals with citizens and not with subjects. It is a policy which disarms rebellion and leads even barbarians to hope.

HORATIO W. SEYMOUR.

IS AMERICAN LITERATURE BOURGEOIS?

BY JOSEPHINE DASKAM BACON.

"AMERICAN Literature to-day, taking it as a whole, taking no account of its strangely few exceptions, is the most timid, the most anæmic, the most lacking in individualities, the most bourgeois, that any country has ever known."

This is a very hard saying. It is not only hard to believe, but it is hard to understand. And this combination of difficulties produces a third: it is hard to take seriously. However, as it is uttered in apparent good faith by an unquestionably popular writer, it must be worth consideration; for it would seem that one who knows how to please the public ought to understand the public temper of mind in more than one regard; ought, in short, to represent a certain constituency of public opinion. And in that case the most extraordinary point of view is worthy of comment.

In the first place, before taking up in detail the half-dozen divisions of the criticism in question, it seems to me necessary to suggest that the very basis of Mrs. Atherton's discussion is unsound. It is by no means a foregone conclusion that the technically artistic achievements of a nation—particularly when limited to one branch of artistic expression—should accurately typify the special genius of that nation.

"Compare it [American Literature] even with the enterprise of the four men who, with a few thousand dollars in their pockets, projected and carried to a triumphant conclusion the great Central Pacific Railroad."

In Heaven's name, why? What would the comparison prove?

"It would seem almost superfluous to wonder what would be a European's reply if one asked him what parallel he found between those of our men whom he regards as typical—such men as Roosevelt, Pierpont Morgan, Yerkes, Cleveland or even Croker—be-

tween our imminent financial supremacy, our devouring commercial inroads, our gigantic trusts violating many laws, our colossal strikes, our utter contempt for the survival of the monarchical superstition in the Old World—and our literature. Where is the parallel?"

Where should it be? It would be so superfluous a question, indeed, that few of us are likely to hang upon the European's reply. Does any one inquire disgustedly why modern Italian sculpture does not rival in present interest wireless telegraphy? Is it a reproach to Germany that her railroad system has not impressed itself upon the public as strongly as the Wagnerian music-drama? Would we have respected the Boers more if they had invented a breakfast food?

So far as devouring commercially and striking colossally go, they are rarely coincident with literary parallels; certainly not by the hands of the devourers and the strikers. And it must be remembered that every Croker has not necessarily his Boswell; and that, even if he had, that Boswell would very improbably live in the same generation. No contemporary of Hester Prynne wrote *The Scarlet Letter;* the shadowy prototype of Gawain never chronicled the Round Table; the unfortunate (and immediate) victims of the Exodus did not devote themselves to epic descriptions of the event: they were busy complaining of the quail.

This accounts for the fact that the present attempts to found the great American novel on the last corner in wheat must invariably produce no further-reaching results than a gratifying income for the author: if that factor is to enter the enduring body of our literature, its artistic creator is not yet born. It is the past or passing type that the eye of genius just catches before it vanishes, and impresses in broad outline on the minds of the men to come.

But, even if we admitted that our imminent financial supremacy and our utter contempt for the survival of the monarchical superstition in the Old World called for an immediate literary parallel and failed to get it, it would be a far cry from this state of affairs to the condition described by Mrs. Atherton's later and more detailed statements. No one imagines that, if the nations were to be summoned to-day to the Judgment Seat, and required, each one, to express in one comprehensive word her plea for posterity's recognition, America would elect to stand or fall by her literary

achievements. This modesty, however, does not prevent a profound assurance on the part of even the most casual reader of current fiction that much good work, yes, very good work indeed, is springing up like young saplings among, behind and underneath the mammoth editions of the best-selling books. If Mrs. Atherton has based her criticism upon these anomalies of the publishing business, much acidity of phrase may be forgiven her. It is highly improbable that any one possessed of the slightest literary susceptibility could survive with sanity, not to say composure, the successive perusal of any five books published within the last five years, whose sales have passed the hundred thousand mark.

But why attempt to survive this useless test? One may successfully lay claim to the title of epicure who has never so much as tasted one of those Threaded Grain Biscuits whose production a few years ago revolutionized the breakfast menu of our country. Eat them if you like, realize fully that thousands of boxes a day are sold, but beware of supposing them an essential characteristic of American cookery. The country is large. If our nation's commercial output must be paralleled in letters, I should say that *David Harum* balanced the Threaded Grain Biscuit very adequately.

Moreover, to be perfectly just, Mrs. Atherton is quite inexcusable if she confuses these literary epidemics, for the most part as inexplicable in origin as other epidemics, with the valuable literary output of the time. A critic is precisely an epicure—not one of the general gorgers. An epicure takes account of the truffle and the apricot: he does not condemn a national *cuisine* after a self-selected meal of unsalted potatoes. And Mrs. Atherton would seem to have done just this. If she has never read the best work that is being done to-day, she is incapable of criticism, for an obvious reason; if she has read it and failed to appreciate it, she is incompetent on another count; if she has both read and appreciated, and omitted to mention it, she is surely out of court.

I am convinced, however, from a consideration of her detailed points, that the first supposition is the correct one, and that she has merely failed to inform herself on the subject of her article. For consider the following five points into which her criticism is divided.

"Let us examine," she says, "the causes which govern the 'aristocracy of American letters.' Originality, except in the

mildest form, we have seen, is proscribed. 'What never has been done never can be done,' may be said to be the motto of American literature."

Now, in calling Mrs. Atherton's attention to the enormous evidence to the contrary of this statement, I am going to leave out of the question entirely the admittedly great names in our literature. I am going to grant cheerfully the somewhat unusual concession she demands in the paragraph I have quoted at the beginning of this article: "taking no account of its [American literature's] strangely few exceptions." I shall not mention the work of Mark Twain and Bret Harte; the only two authors selected here for praise, though I question the right of any critic to separate from a given mass of material the best examples of it, on the ground that they are exceptions. I shall not mention the great vogue of Artemus Ward and Bill Nye, whose originality alone outweighed, to the public mind, much coarseness and banality. Nor shall I assume that Mrs. Atherton uses the word "originality" in its absolute sense. If we are to understand by the originality of a form of literature the actually first occasion in the history of man when a style or a subject appeared, our research would in all probability find itself still some distance from the earliest sources when it handled the scratched thigh-bones of the cave-men. I shall take "originality" in the simple sense of an acknowledged departure from the accepted methods, the ordinary subjects. And I shall name the first half-dozen authors that occurred to me instantly on reading Mrs. Atherton's last-quoted sentence, suggested, without catalogues or publishers' announcements, by a memory whose capacity is rather below than above the average.

Is it necessary to mention the enthusiasm that greeted *Wild Animals I Have Known?* These stories did not commend themselves through their biological accuracy: they were read and bought and praised because they were rattling good tales in an entirely new field, and their imitators are only now waning in popularity. The love-affairs of woodchucks, the psychological processes of ground-worms, are feeding and clothing many estimable writers to-day; and many a guileless school-teacher arises at dawn to peep at a sparrow through an opera-glass, listening subsequently with respectful credulity to semi-literary lectures on the social, moral and civic experiences of that unconscious bird,

simply because Mr. Thompson's originality so fascinated us six or eight years ago.

Very recently, Mr. Stewart White, possessed by the solitary, primeval charm of the Canadian woods and the logging camp, delighted thousands of desk-chained townsmen by the novelty of the scenes he spread for them. This success was not due to his mastery of his craft, for not a few short-story writers excel him in technique, in the sense of dramatic situation, in restraint of style, in choice of words. Moreover, he demands a large measure of the easy forgiveness of the city-dweller for that more than occasional gush that, since Rousseau, has invariably accompanied the conscious modern's return to nature. But even the critical-minded forgave him this—for his work was new. Any one who has ever paddled a canoe into the middle of a ten-mile lake has ample material now for a back-to-nature novel.

Still later, Mrs. Martin captured the public heart with one of the most successful collections of short stories recently published. Why did every one fall a victim to the charms of little *Emmy Lou?* It was not because the author possesses an intrinsic felicity of phrase, or because her outlook on life is at all broad, or deep or stimulating. If we are to judge from the opening instalments of her first serial, which are unmarked by one distinguishing feature, this writer has mistaken the power to describe accurately characteristics and situations well known to her for the possession of constructive imagination. There was even nothing unusual or extraordinary in Emmy Lou or her surroundings. Many people who had actually shared her experiences, which were for the most part wholly objective, could have found nothing in them but the recapitulation of their own school-days. But this was precisely the striking originality of the series. To unfold the painfully acquired education of a perfectly ordinary, lovable, middle-class little girl, with no claim upon our attention but her simple humanity and its childlike acceptance of that strange business, life; to offer her childish experiences, not as the prelude to a problem novel, but as an end in themselves; to dare to suggest that, though neither an immigrant, a Jew, a member of some strange religious sect, nor an inhabitant of some tiny last-generation rural hamlet, her sturdy little personality was worthy of chronicle, was indeed an innovation. And it has met a deserved appreciation.

Again, while it is difficult to claim a distinct originality for Mr.

Booth Tarkington's *Monsieur Beaucaire,* it is almost equally difficult to find a literary fragment of its delicate proportions with which to compare it. Even though it was dramatized, it cannot be called a historical novel. It does not deal with that extraordinarily disagreeable social *milieu* naïvely described by the novelist of the Middle West as "American life." Its workmanship has been easily, if not too frequently, matched by other tales whose reception has not been half so loudly acclaimed—and why is this? Because *Monsieur Beaucaire* was a departure, a new effect.

To what does Mrs. Atherton attribute the immense vogue of Mary Wilkins? Not to the information she gave us of the New England character. She did not discover this field. To say nothing of Mrs. Stowe in her generation, Miss Sarah Orne Jewett before Miss Wilkins, and Miss Alice Brown after her, have given us a saner, better balanced, more sympathetic treatment of New England life and spirit; in many cases, too, through the medium of a richer, more cultivated style, a maturer diction, than the author of *A New England Nun.*

What was the first claim, to both critical and general attention, of these famous sketches? Their amazing novelty. This author, unlike the first-mentioned four, excepting, perhaps, Mr. Tarkington, based her success quite as much on novelty of method as on freshness of material, and stands in consequence head and shoulders above them artistically; but she unquestionably owes her first brilliant reception, on whatever deeper and more enduring foundation her reputation with posterity may rest, to her originality.

In connection with this first canon, Mrs. Atherton describes "one of a number of stories which are still fresh in my mind. One, by a popular magazine writer of long standing, is about a girl who went from San Francisco to Chicago in a Pullman car and returned. This is all that happened." Though I do not recall, from this somewhat naïve summary of its plot, the story in question, I am not sure that it is quite fairly dismissed. It makes one wonder if Mrs. Atherton would describe the book of Job as the story of a petulant old gentleman unfortunately afflicted with boils, from which he ultimately recovered? In this connection, too, the fact that a story by Gelett Burgess—and one that was quite unworthy of him, at that,—was the best that this critic could find, or believes that any one can find, "not only in the best of current novels, but in two bound volumes of any one of the

big magazines," makes one curious as to what magazines she reads. That any one should be confined to a story by Gelett Burgess for "a single grace of phrase, a fine thought, careful or distinguished writing," places the genial author of the *Purple Cow* in a new light to most of us. It is pleasant for Burgess, but hard on the other young men who have worked at the short story during recent years, with more generally recognized results.

However, this severe critic admits the existence of "perhaps four or five regular contributors to the magazines who write with distinction, and conform admirably to all the canons of the short story." This is, indeed, as she says further on, "something to be grateful for." It is, in fact, when one considers it a little, perhaps higher praise than Mrs. Atherton, to judge from the context, quite realizes. To write with distinction, and conform admirably to all the canons of the novel, for instance, would not be a bad ideal for a popular novelist.

The second canon, "that this world is not as it is, but as it ought to be," may seem to the logical mind to conflict slightly with a further exposition of it, which describes American writers as "spending their years comfortably describing the little life about them, adding nothing whatever to the knowledge of mankind. . . . They mildly interest people who are used to them, and can get nothing else."

Now, it is necessary to state that, after this paragraph—which abounds in statements of this kind: "It [American literature] is as correct as Sunday clothes and as innocuous as sterilized milk" —and after much complaint of the realism and "littleism" of our novels and stories, together with some previous remarks on Mr. Howells, one is reluctantly forced to the conclusion that much, if not all, of Mrs. Atherton's severity is called forth by what may be safely described as the least exciting work of the Dean of American letters. It does not require much audacity to admit that Mr. Howells has not reached, in all his books, the level of *Indian Summer* or *A Modern Instance*. But this and many more such criticisms were all made some years ago, when many of the most popular writers of to-day were in short petticoats and knickerbockers; and the great influence of *Silas Lapham's* creator has long since been so thoroughly assimilated that it is far less marked than the recent trail of Kipling. What was the year of the two bound volumes of the magazine that Mrs. Atherton read?

I am going to suggest for her perusal three stories recently written by Americans, each one of which I consider to have added directly to the knowledge of mankind, and to show the world, not as it ought to be, but as it is. One of them is called *The Note.* It is one of a series of short stories, *Dr. Lavendar's People,* by Mrs. Margaret Deland, and deals with life in a quaint, aristocratic, old-school village—a kind of American Cranford. The second is called *The Golden Ford.* It is one of a collection, *Red Saunders,* by Henry Wallace Phillips, and deals with cowboy life on the Western plains. The third is called *The Desert.* It is one of two short stories, published together, by Arthur Cosslett Smith, and deals with life in an obscure oasis of the Desert of Sahara.

The first concerns the relations of four men, springing out of their intimate connection with a pathetic, sordid little village tragedy of the kind that was old when Babylon was new. If ever a scene was laid in a *milieu* presumably "as correct as Sunday clothes and as innocuous as sterilized milk," it is this one. But, unfortunately for Mrs. Atherton's somewhat surprising point of view, it is not necessary to "see the world" very extensively to realize that the human nature inhabiting it is very much of a piece; and that bitter family pride, cruel obstinacy, starved affections, good-natured vulgarity and broad-hearted, indomitable loving-kindness will act and interact as intensely and inevitably in a tiny rural community as in the most picturesquely cosmopolitan district. Consequently, Mrs. Deland is enabled to show us emotions and situations neither correct nor innocuous, but, through the medium of an art so restrained and simple, displaying a breadth of view so tolerant and sympathetic that the sordidness of the situation is lost in the distinction of the treatment.

The second, which details a few experiences of two occasionally idiotic, often indefensible and always irresponsible miner-cowboys, surpasses, in its general hell-for-leather jollity and its particular pervasive humor, any story of anything of its kind I have read since Huckleberry Finn ran away. Compared with *Red Saunders* *The Virginian* of many editions is, indeed, very nearly sterilized and certainly innocuous. But then, *Red Saunders* is admittedly the hero of several disconnected episodes, and *The Virginian* is only disguisedly so. If in reading this story Mrs. Atherton can find any hint of life as it ought to be, she will have proved herself more studious of American fiction than her recent criticism indi-

cates. But she will find an immense amount of broad-gauge, well-ventilated human nature in it and a larger proportion of quotable humor than this appreciation has room to include.

The third is a love-story of Arabs in the desert. It is direct and simple, with that simplicity of diction which may deceive the mass of ordinary readers, but which could not fail, one would suppose, to impress one of the author's fellow craftsmen with an intense admiration for its subtle art of selection and incision. It has no more concern for conventional morality than *Solomon's Song* or *Without Benefit of Clergy*. It is impossible to mention Sunday clothes or sterilized milk in connection with it, so far are its calm implications of primitive passions and civilized vices removed from these articles. Its delicacy of style and play of epigram surpass the other two tales, and its foreign setting might impress the inexperienced with the fact that its author had more notably "seen the world"; but its technique must chiefly recommend it to the trained observer.

Now, I must insist that I am not unique in my utter lack of personal experience of the three utterly different settings of these three stories—selected, by the way, easily and immediately on the basis of their excellence, and not with a view to their geographical range. I have never lived in a town like Old Chester, or on a ranch, or an oasis in the Desert of Sahara. Many of us, even if we were possessed of Mrs. Atherton's expansive ambition for "seeing life from its peaks to its chasms," couldn't, to use an expressive phrase, quite get around to it—in one incarnation, at least. So these three authors added appreciably to my knowledge, besides giving me great pleasure by the exercise of their technical skill. It is not, emphatically, that I am "used to them and can get nothing else." I can get anything else I want to, more or less, like most of us who have the use of our eyes and a dollar and a half.

I have discussed the second point of this criticism somewhat at length because its examples serve admirably by way of reply to the next in order: "A third canon, which is indeed but a part of the second, is that fiction to be literature—American literature—must be anæmic."

It is impossible to discuss at length this sentence and the still more extravagant one that follows it, because of the haunting and inevitable conviction that Mrs. Atherton has not read very much

American fiction. If *The Note* and *The Golden Ford* and *The Desert* and, for that matter, the other tales in the books which they represent, are anæmic, then I am as ignorant of the meaning of the word as most of us are ignorant of the precise meaning of "*bourgeois*" in the present connection.

In case Mrs. Atherton has read anything of merit since Cooper and Poe, but has not quite reached the last decade, I will go back a little and inquire if she thinks *Posson Jone* anæmic? It is true that Mr. Cable has fallen a victim to that last infirmity of noble minds, the mysteriously entitled historical novel, where his friends must regretfully abandon him; but one need not on that account forget his good years, and *Posson Jone* alone, to say nothing of *The Grandissimes*, will surely add something to Mrs. Atherton's knowledge—if only of American literature.

Is Miss Woolson's *Jupiter Lights* anæmic? Are any of her best short stories?

Colonel Carter of Cartersville may not prove so enduring a type as we once thought, but is he anæmic?

Did Mrs. Atherton find *The Story of Gallagher* anæmic?

This catalogue might be prolonged by any average reader, but to what purpose?

The fourth canon I can only quote, for I am prompt to confess that, though I am perfectly acquainted with the meaning of the separate words, in combination they convey absolutely no idea to my mind:

"A fourth canon is what might be called the fetish of the body. Magazine editors, their confederate publishers, their writers and readers, deify the body, grovel in the dust before it. It never has done and can do no wrong. . . . Let the brain rot. The brain is invisible and insignificant. Let the mind close its doors to the best of literature, to the immensity of life, but let it keep its physical framework even as a little child."

Now what on earth does this mean? What is "the fetish of the body"? I know several magazine editors and their confederate publishers, I know some of their writers and many of their readers; but I never saw one of them deifying this mysterious article or grovelling in the dust before it, and, what is more, until she is more definite, I shall not believe that Mrs. Atherton ever did.

"A fifth canon is that sleep must not be disturbed nor even the nerves titillated."

It is quite unnecessary to discuss this, as the only proof adduced is the statement that a gathering of "demi-fashionable people" once declined to have read to it a "briefly tragic" and "rather terrible" story, on the ground that "there might be sensitive ladies present whose nerves would be distressingly affected." It is to be hoped that the author of this brief and terrible tale took steps to get it before the reading public, in default of the appreciation of the demi-fashionable gathering!

We now come to a heavy indictment of "the prosperous family authors," who, their implacable critic assures us, "are all good family men, who eat well, rarely drink, and are too dull to be bored with their own wives." It is not only safe to say, but comforting to realize, that all men, married or otherwise, eat as well as they can. Or is this an original fashion of suggesting that Carlyle was great because he was dyspeptic? But how can Mrs. Atherton possibly know that "these arbitrary creations of the leading publishing houses and their magazines" rarely drink? If this is an example of what is called internal evidence, it is an interesting one, to say the least. And if they *are* too dull to be bored with their own wives, then how—but I suspect that we are verging insensibly from literary criticism as such. To return to the following assertion that "each could do the other's work and never be detected": Does Mrs. Atherton really seem to see Richard Harding Davis writing Henry Harland's books with any verisimilitude?

"To be great, it is above all things necessary to develop your ego," she continues. This idea has been shared most notably by Marie Bashkirtseff, although more recently by a young countrywoman of ours named Mary MacLane. Each of these young persons developed her ego to the exclusion of most other things, and it is only fair to them to add that the only people known to have surpassed them in this regard are the comparatively indistinguishable inhabitants of our leading insane asylums, which furnish many and varied examples of the results of this propensity.

It is a pleasure to find among all these baffling generalities one or two final definite statements. When Mrs. Atherton announces that, "no writer with a real gift and with a real ambition has any business with a home, children, the unintermittent comforts of life which stultify and stifle," at least we see where she stands—though not, perhaps, why she stands there. When she asks, "If

a man has the gift to write, to create,—the greatest of all gifts,—what more does he want?" the answer is very easy, because the question is so perfectly clear. The experience of the world has proved that such a man wants everything more that this gratified and grateful world can give him, and that the first things he sets about getting are a home and children—and the unintermittent comforts of life, if he can, though neither of the former acquisitions affords any certainty of the latter. A writer with a real gift and a real ambition may have no business with these things, but from the time of David the Psalmist he has done his best to get them, and almost uniformly succeeded. And, such being the deeply rooted tendency of human nature, it is improbable that contemporary criticism of it will affect the present or the future generations much more deeply than, in the nature of things, it can affect the dead and gone.

When our critic goes on to say that it is difficult for women to take life impersonally, no one of the thousands who have said it before will deny that she is within her rights. But when she goes on to lament the further improbability of her sex's "developing the strength of brain and ego triumphantly to override every convention and always remain high and dry, always the spectator, whom no circumstance can affect," one is disposed to congratulate these "miserable victims of their own personalities" on their disabilities. Personally, I admit freely that the only objects I have ever met or heard of, of whom it could be said that they "remained high and dry, always the spectator, whom no circumstance could affect," are some of Bulwer Lytton's heroes and the mummies in a museum.

Mrs. Atherton makes but one other and final remark that directly challenges comment; but that one, in view of the extraordinary manner in which she follows it up, it is impossible to pass over, since it illuminates so vividly her curious method of criticism.

"Who cares to-day," she demands, "that Poe was a drunkard, Coleridge an opium-eater, that Byron had forty mistresses, and George Sand forty lovers?"

As a matter of purely personal taste, if the works of George Sand are to be attributed in any degree to her having had forty lovers, I wish she had had either eighty, or none at all. But as far as Poe is concerned, I regret exceedingly that he was a drunk-

ard, as did his friends, acquaintances and publishers. When I read the best of his unique work and then observe into what hysterical flightiness it is capable of degenerating; when I consider his early and tragic death, and his hampered and unhappy life, I devoutly wish that some less valuable writer might have inherited his misfortune in his stead, and left him free to make one of our greatest names greater.

When I reflect on those of Coleridge's lines that are unsurpassed in English poetry, and realize how few those lines are—but why continue in this vein? Mrs. Atherton herself, in a somewhat dizzy turn, after tolerantly assuring us that "excess is not necessary," and that "many of the greatest men in literature have been sane, and careful of themselves,"—which explains, probably, why George Sand is not forty times as great as George Eliot, and why Wordsworth had at least forty per cent. of Byron's inspiration—confuses, if she reassures, us by asserting that "the temperaments that demand artificial stimulation pay a bitter price, *and, what is worse, limit their contribution to art*"! So we may infer that Mrs. Atherton, like the rest of us, "cares that Poe was a drunkard and Coleridge an opium-eater."

And here, in a totally unexpected and unaccountably ascetic diatribe against the use of coffee—a mine of resource to the manufacturers of the probably valuable cereal beverages—this extraordinary criticism closes. Just, to state it strongly, as we begin to feel that Miss Jewett's art could be improved by a course of slumming, or at least a slight addiction to morphine, we find ourselves wondering what Mark Twain might have accomplished if he had never tasted coffee!

At any rate, even if all American fiction is anæmic, some American criticism escapes that adjective. Might we not call it, rather, apoplectic?

JOSEPHINE DASKAM BACON.

A FOREIGN ESTIMATE OF MR. ROOSEVELT.

BY ANGLO-AMERICAN.

THE characteristic of President Roosevelt is that he is always wanting to do something; the characteristic of the American Constitution is that it is a sort of conspiracy for doing nothing. To me, at least, the ceaseless, subterranean conflict between these two characteristics has been the most interesting feature of the Presidency of Mr. Roosevelt. He is a man who, with an unresting instinct for leadership and domination, finds himself cribbed, cabined and confined by an office that makes leadership on any large scale almost impossible.

The Sages of 1789 framed the Constitution under the dread of a strong Executive. Whatever else the President might be, they took good care he should not be a George the Third. They were morbidly on the defensive against the evils of "one-man power." Accordingly, the functions and authority of each power in the State were so limited that no one person, no one body, is capable of leading either the nation or the legislature, or of framing and pursuing a continuous policy. Each organ of government—the Executive, the Legislature, the Judiciary—is made a jealous observer and restrainer of the others. Nobody has even a comparatively free hand. The framers of the Constitution, I have always thought, accomplished more than they intended. They divided the Executive from the Legislature so firmly as to make each not only independent of the other, but in a sense hostile, and therefore weak. The connecting link which in England goes under the name of the Cabinet they either missed or did not appreciate. In the quiet times which have ordinarily been the lot of the Republic, I do not know that much inconvenience has resulted from the rivalries of this triad of authorities. Some great questions, the currency for instance, which under a more positive form of govern-

ment would have been settled long ago, have been merely tinkered at. But many rash schemes of legislation have been squashed, many hot-headed Presidents held in check, many successive Houses "taught their place." It is when the country is face to face with some national peril, and immediate action becomes imperative, that the Presidential system of 1789 shows its defects. At all such times Congress practically abdicates. This was what happened during the war of 1812, the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War; and there is really no choice in the matter. An autocracy in times of emergency is the price America has to pay for her checks and balances in ordinary times.

It is, therefore, extremely difficult for an Englishman to appraise with any accuracy the extent of the President's authority. From one aspect, he seems to have more real power than the German Emperor; from another, one might argue that his influence on legislation is considerably less than a British Premier's. Even when his party commands a majority in both Houses his power over the actual course of legislation depends almost wholly on the good-will of Congress. He may recommend everything, but he can direct nothing. Neither he nor his Cabinet Ministers sit in Congress or hold any recognized communication with it except through the medium of written messages. I have even noticed that an appeal to the known wishes or opinions of the President is resented as dictation. The President, it is true, has his veto, and that is a powerful weapon, for defence at any rate. It is in attack that he is tied and hampered. His Presidential Messages may point the way, but neither he nor any one can insure that it will be followed. Congress in all such matters is its own master, and the success of any Administration depends on the harmony that exists between Congress and the Executive.

This is as much as to say that the qualities most useful to a President in the discharge of his office are those rather of a diplomat than of a leader; and that his success will be more in proportion to his skill in the small arts of managing men than to his capacity for framing schemes of legislation and insisting on their being carried. The type of Executive to which the Constitution naturally inclines was excellently exemplified by the character and method of Mr. McKinley. Mr. McKinley appeared to subordinate everything to the maintenance of harmony between the two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. He oiled the machinery

of Government with a loving and imperturbable patience, and the wheels ran with an ease unknown since Washington's first term of office. His was a cautious, persuasive, accordant nature. He hated to say No. Outside of Protection, he had few interests and fewer convictions; none, perhaps, that he would not have felt it a duty to sacrifice at the bidding of the people. He accepted fully and heartily the doctrine that the President should follow and not attempt to lead public opinion. Great things happened during his Presidency, but he can hardly be said to have presided over them. Once convinced of what the people wanted—and his instinct in such matters was all but infallible; he knew his countrymen as Palmerston knew Englishmen—Mr. McKinley would work overtime to see that they got it. His ways of dealing with Congress were such as sprang inevitably from his conception of the Presidential duties. They were those of adroit persuasion. He consulted everybody, humored everybody, put himself frankly in the hands of his friends, made the utmost use of patronage as a gentle weapon of conciliation, and usually reached his goal.

The American Presidency is a very human office. Its influence depends at least as much on the man who occupies it as on its Constitutional prerogatives. Unless it be the Papacy, I know of no office in which personality counts for more and opinions for less. The accession of Mr. Roosevelt meant a change, not because his policy differed from Mr. McKinley's, but because in character, disposition and their instinctive views of Presidential functions, the two men stood at opposite poles. As politicians, they were in agreement to a degree rarely, if ever, attained by a President and a Vice-President; as men they were fundamentally dissimilar. The contrast between the new Executive and the old was so sharp as to be almost revolutionary. I do not wonder that the conservatism of America involuntarily shuddered when it compared the present and the possibilities of the future with the placid and frictionless past. Even in Europe there were some misgivings. People suspected Mr. Roosevelt of a tendency to jingoism; they recalled some outbursts of ultra-Bismarckian frankness on the Monroe Doctrine and on the Alaska difficulty; they knew that he was the only living ruler who had led a regiment on the battlefield; and they had read in his books some rather elementary panegyrics of war as a healthy national exercise. It was not, therefore, without uneasiness and a certain expectancy of

lively times ahead that Europe, and England especially, watched Mr. Roosevelt's accession. I am bound to say that this uneasiness has now completely vanished. It took William II. ten years to live down the nervousness which his elevation to the throne of the Hohenzollerns inspired. It took Theodore Roosevelt just one year. We recognize in him a new and more determined force in foreign affairs, but not a bellicose force. Viewing him simply as an American President, it struck Englishmen that he was a reversion to an older type—the type that prevailed more abundantly before the coming of the Boss, and when merit in a Presidential candidate was considered of more importance than "availability." Mr. Roosevelt interested Englishmen particularly because he seemed to belong rather to the English than to the American order of public men. Long before he became Vice-President, we knew of him as a mighty hunter and a good all-round sportsman. We watched him in Cuba doing all the brilliant, reckless and Quixotic things that attract the applause of the populace. We watched him again in the Governorship of New York, bending the "machine" to his will with consummate ability and courage. We knew that he was a college man, with a good lineage behind him, a gentleman both in the right and in the technical sense, and a man of independent means. We have always felt an affinity with Mr. Roosevelt; we can imagine him taking part in English politics just as he is; we detect a greater congruity in him with English public life than we ever discerned in Presidents Harrison, Garfield, McKinley or Cleveland. Mr. Sydney Brooks, dwelling on this in a recent number of *Harper's Weekly,* said:

"If he [Mr. Roosevelt] were an Englishman people feel that he would have explored every inch of the Empire, shot all the big game to be found in it, won his Blue at Oxford or Cambridge, kept a pack of hounds, written some slashing books on Wellington and Nelson and the heroes of the Indian Mutiny, captured De Wet, annexed an empire or two, and made his mark in Parliament as a progressive Conservative. People here feel they would know what to do with Mr. Roosevelt, and I dare say Mr. Roosevelt feels he would know what to do with them."

One of the reasons why Mr. Roosevelt would succeed so well in English politics is that the instinct for command is innate in him. He has a natural gift for exhortation, instruction, telling people what to do and think. He cannot help leading. I do not

mean to imply that this quality in any way unfits him for American public life. On the contrary, the force of its attractiveness is peculiarly felt by Americans, who are an emotional people, always ready to exalt any man who rises even an inch above the undistinguished multitude, swiftly responsive to a touch of firmness. They will follow a leader, when they find one, farther than most nations, and forgive him, as they forgave Grant, almost anything. In politics, especially, the man who trusts to his own strength and will fight to the last for his convictions, commands their instant homage. Mr. Roosevelt has this quality of political courage to a degree that Cleveland did not equal and Lincoln did not surpass; and with the masses it is the sheet-anchor of his strength. But the politicians, with their natural preference for a "manageable" President, do not like it, and I am not sure that the Constitution wholly approves of it. It has, at any rate, been obvious enough that Mr. Roosevelt by coercion has not been able to accomplish as much as Mr. McKinley by persuasion. That his methods are more inspiriting to watch can hardly be doubted, but whether they are so successful in getting things done is another and more dubious question. Take, for instance, the Cuban Reciprocity Treaty. I immensely admire the fight he made on its behalf, but I can scarcely doubt that Mr. McKinley would have achieved the same result without any fight at all. Mr. Roosevelt was mandatory, vehement, almost belligerent in his advocacy of the measure; Mr. McKinley would have coaxed it through Congress with barely a rub. On the other hand, had Mr. McKinley by some miracle failed at the first attempt, I question whether he would have tried again. With Mr. Roosevelt, to fail once is simply to make success a certainty the second time; and nothing could have been finer—remembering that his Presidency had but just begun and that its success absolutely depended on keeping the party together and avoiding friction with Congress—than the way in which he stuck to his guns, rallied public opinion to his side, and eventually forced the Legislature to do his bidding.

One of Mr. McKinley's greatest successes was his loosening of the bonds that tie the Southern States in an unhealthy and wholly factitious alliance to the Democratic party. Mr. Roosevelt, by some acts of almost gratuitous clumsiness, has restored that alliance in all its old rigidity, and in doing so has aroused a bitterness of racial passion in the South unequalled since the horrors of the

Reconstruction Period. Here, again, it has not been so much the thing done as his abruptly irritating way of doing it that has caused the trouble. Mr. McKinley would, of course, have been incapable of any such disastrous blunder as the Booker Washington lunch; but Mr. McKinley appointed far more negroes to office than Mr. Roosevelt has ventured to, and yet, roughly speaking, no one took any notice of it. I cannot, at a distance of three thousand miles, even attempt to explain why a policy pursued by Mr. Roosevelt should appear so much more obnoxious than the same policy when pursued by Mr. McKinley. But I suspect that the cause of it will be found to be not unconnected with the value of manner in politics. Mr. Roosevelt has little of the appreciation of manner that Mr. McKinley cultivated. He has none of his predecessor's suavity and suppleness, none of his extraordinary skill in reconciling, humoring, persuading—in short, none of his great personal and political tact. To a man, indeed, who sees what he sees clearly and instantaneously, who feels what he feels with almost physical intensity, who is about equally compact of positiveness and emotionalism, tact probably seems superfluous, and the exercise of it a waste of time. Hints and paraphrases and the tedious waiting while stupidity makes up its mind, are not for him. But I should not call him an impulsive man. He is a man of impulses and they are strong and vivid, but they rarely get out of hand or succeed in breaking through his background of solid Dutch caution and level-headedness. That he has to keep a constant watch over himself and his emotions is true enough; but it is also true that he all but invariably succeeds in doing so. Mind and feelings work side by side in him and at a speed that the average man finds it difficult to keep up with. But feelings alone are never his guide; still less are mere theories. It has always been the characteristic of Mr. Roosevelt to mingle altruism with practicality. He recognizes facts with a candor abhorrent to the hypercritical mugwump. In some ways, I do not know a more thoroughly "practical" politician in all America, unless it be Mr. Croker. The "strenuous life" he used to be so fond of talking about is, I take it, simply a life of honest, active endeavor in any sphere. But to meet with Mr. Roosevelt's approval it must also be a life that is regulated by judgment and good sense. His own temperament is essentially Whiggish, content to advance a step at a time, inexorable on vital points, but never yielding to the

extremists. His books reflect him with unmistakable precision. The prose is hard, confident, metallic, without light or shade, yet strong in its rush and resonance. He moves swiftly along the road of clanking commonplace. I do not suppose that in all he has published you will find a single original or a single stupid idea. His mind is both inquisitive and acquisitive, thoroughly sane, not shallow, but certainly not deep, healthily non-creative, a good, wholesome bludgeon of a mind. Nor is it only the man's mind that appears in his writings; the man himself is equally obvious, in all his clean-cut openness and straightforward sincerity.

It has often been said that one of the best tests of a President's character is to be found in the appointments he makes. Judged, then, by the quality of his appointments, I think Mr. Roosevelt must rank among the most capable and public-spirited Presidents in American history. No President has so persistently eliminated "politics" from his nominations, none has been more unbending in making efficiency his sole test; and none has held Senators to a stricter account for the proper use of their prerogatives. I cannot see that he has in any way trespassed on the Senatorial preserves or attempted to usurp any of the powers vested in them by the Constitution. What he has done is to insist on a new and higher standard by which those powers are to be exercised. In that attitude, inflexibly maintained, he has shown equal courage and judiciousness, neither foregoing his Constitutional rights nor stretching them, neither appearing as a slave to party nor superior to it. Indeed, it would be difficult to say where Mr. Roosevelt has failed on the administrative side of his office. No President ever brought to the discharge of his Executive duties anything like Mr. Roosevelt's varied experience and thorough qualifications. I would not claim for him the sole credit for the remarkable records which Mr. Root and Mr. Moody have achieved in their respective Departments, nor yet for the excellent start that has been made with the Bureau of Commerce and Labor; but the tone and capacity of the public services have immensely improved in the last three years—in spite of the Post-office scandals—and for much of the improvement Mr. Roosevelt's own spirit and example must be responsible.

Turning from matters of administration to those of domestic policy and legislation, the centre of interest, for an Englishman, is naturally shifted to Mr. Roosevelt's "campaign" against the

Trusts. The spectacular nature of that campaign forced the attention of all Europe; as to its intrinsic value, opinions differed. Personally it seems to me that the popular agitation on the subject had reached a point where it could no longer be ignored; that if Mr. Roosevelt had attempted to ignore it, the Democrats would at once have turned it to account; that the course he actually steered was a judicious mean between the intemperance of Bryanism and the fearfulness or indifference of some of his own followers; and that if the panic about the Trusts has now largely passed, the reason is to be looked for in the calm spirit, the courage and sanity with which Mr. Roosevelt tackled the problem. By persisting in and finally carrying his demand for "Publicity," Mr. Roosevelt has not only stolen the Democratic thunder, but warded off the danger that the Trusts would be dealt with in a moment of frenzy or in a spirit of blind vengeance. That is to say, he has perfectly justified his original statement that his movement against the Trusts was a movement really in favor of Capital, of Labor and of the public interests. If the Trusts are no longer a "vital" issue, it is Mr. Roosevelt whom the Wall Street magnates should thank; and their gratitude should be all the greater when they reflect at what little cost to themselves the President has contrived to appease the public mind. On the other hand, I think the best commercial opinion of England has pronounced against Mr. Roosevelt's action in the Northern Securities case, on the ground, first, that a railway consolidation is, from the point of view of public interests, a very different thing from an ordinary industrial amalgamation; secondly, that the process of railway unification has immensely promoted the convenience of the travelling public and has brought security to the railways, to investors and to the shippers of goods; and, thirdly, that the effect of the Northern Securities decision on the two railroads concerned was, for all practical purposes, *nil,* that their special relations will continue to be as intimate as ever, and that all that was destroyed was the financial form in which those relations were expressed. I confess to a good deal of sympathy with this reasoning. No sensible American, I apprehend, wants to go back to the days of cut-throat railroad competition with its permanent waste, furious rate-wars and their concomitant evils of rebates, discriminations and systematic favoritism. Everybody recognizes that unity and stability in service, rates, fares, time-tables and so on

are the true principles of a good railway system. The Sherman Anti-Trust Act unhappily recognizes nothing of the kind. It denounces every arrangement between companies to fix rates, for instance, as a combination "in restraint of trade." No matter how reasonable the arrangement might be, or how much the public might benefit by it, the law condemns it. The true moral, in my opinion, to be drawn from the Northern Securities decision is not that the Sherman Anti-Trust Act should be enforced, but that it should be altered. As it stands, it is simply a relic of the competitive age lasting on into an age of consolidation. It may create uncertainty and disorganize business temporarily, but it cannot restrain or even hinder the deep-seated movement towards amalgamation. It is possible that, before very long, all the railways of the United States may be found grouped together in some ten or twelve systems. It is possible that from this stage they may pass into the ownership of the Government. What is not possible is that they should ever split up into the tangle of ill-connected and desperately competing lines from which they have emerged. Congress would do better to recognize this at once, to grant the railroad companies a greater legal freedom, and at the same time take stricter precautions against their abuse of it. Mr. Roosevelt justified his resurrection of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act by urging that, the law being on the Statute Book, he was bound to enforce it. That is a lawyer's quibble, not the argument of a statesman. If that view obtained, no law would ever become obsolete. He is apparently unconscious of any intermediate stage between the enforcement of a law and its repeal.

Englishmen, who do not live under a written Constitution, have little inclination for political pedantry. They could not, therefore, sympathize with the Democratic attacks made upon Mr. Roosevelt for his intervention in the coal strike on the ground that it was unconstitutional. To Englishmen, the Presidential office never seemed to display a higher usefulness than at that moment. Their only wonder was that intervention had been so long delayed. Neither could they support the capitalists' plea that Mr. Roosevelt's action would "increase the arrogance of Labor and fill it with the mischievous notion that the President was its special protector." If Labor really felt any temptation to wax "arrogant," I conceive that Mr. Roosevelt's decisiveness in the Miller case must have made resistance easy. It cannot be fairly charged against

Mr. Roosevelt that he has discriminated against any section or any class in the country. The scales, sometimes, one suspects, in spite of great provocation, have always been evenly held. Nor has he ever shirked a problem or tried to sidetrack it—unless, indeed, it be the Tariff problem. Englishmen naturally could not subscribe to the President's dictum that the Trust question and the Tariff question were entirely distinct, and they have seemed to detect in his various remarks on Reciprocity, Revision and the rescue of the Tariff from party politics a certain lack of his usual earnestness and practicality. The only act of his, however, they have seriously condemned was his recent Pensions Order. That struck Englishmen as a thoroughly pernicious measure for which no excuse was visible. It seemed to strike so decisively across all the principles for which Mr. Roosevelt had been supposed to stand and to augment so wantonly the greatest scandal in American public life, that for the first and only time people began to have their doubts, to wonder whether Mr. Roosevelt was really the reformer he seemed, and to ask if he too had descended to the level of "playing politics."

I have left myself little space in which to deal with Mr. Roosevelt's—or should it be Mr. Hay's?—policy in foreign affairs, and can only say that in all the incidents that have cropped up during the last three years—the Venezuelan mess, China, Panama, the Monroe Doctrine, Alaska and the Russo-Japanese war—American policy has won the heartiest admiration among all classes of Englishmen by its dexterity, its decisiveness and its admirable adaptation of means to ends. The suspicion of Anglophobia which attached to Mr. Roosevelt when he stepped into the White House, has long since been dissipated. We have, indeed, come to look upon him as a statesman whose influence will supplement that of Mr. McKinley, Lord Salisbury and Lord Pauncefote in hastening the inevitable day of Anglo-American cooperation in more than one field of *Weltpolitik*. I need scarcely add that England can hardly conceive the possibility of Mr. Roosevelt's defeat next November. He towers head and shoulders above all his Democratic rivals except Mr. Cleveland. He has proved himself an administrator of absolutely the first rank. Englishmen simply take it for granted that Americans will think twice and thrice before they part with such a man.

ANGLO-AMERICAN.

THE NEW HELL.

BY GEORGE T. KNIGHT, PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN TUFTS COLLEGE.

ST. JOHN the Revelator saw "a new heaven and a new earth"; but it was reserved for the prophets of the present day to declare a new hell. The new differs from the old in two respects, according to standard authorities, first as to the number of inhabitants, and secondly as to their condition. Father Taylor, who, though an orthodox preacher, was an admirer of Emerson, said: "If that man should go to hell he would change the climate, and emigration would set that way." As a matter of fact, however, the movement of population has been in the other direction, and the great change in meteorology has come about through a cause not mentioned by Taylor, the increase of kindly feelings outside the place.

Some years ago St. George Mivart wrote a series of articles on "Happiness in Hell," according to Roman Catholic doctrines. The articles were afterwards condemned by the Pope and the Congregation of the Index; but whether they were condemned because Mivart's statements were untrue, or simply because they were inopportune, or for some other reason, does not appear. At any rate, the writer seemed to have made it clear that, within that great and in many respects liberal Church, there is nothing to forbid the opinion that a measure of happiness is granted to the lost, nor, until the Congregation acted, was there anything to forbid the publication of such an opinion. How large a number of the members of the Church avail themselves of the privilege of holding this faith, we do not know; though Mr. Mivart received from his brethren testimony that he did not stand alone.

In several of the Protestant churches there is a greater freedom of speech, and we may know more exactly the state of opinion. There is a great flood of altruism or sympathy rising in

the community, and modifying opinions and practices in all departments of life. It is not merely that public charities are now flourishing as they never flourished before, and hospitals are daily increasing in number and efficiency. The fact is that human character is changing, and human opinions are involved in the change. Witness the manifold expressions of brotherly feeling between the religious sects; and, still better, the common view that regards this more kindly sentiment as an important advance in Christianity itself.

The student of history perceives in all this a sign that the church is becoming more and more conscious of a tendency or influence that has long been at work, especially in the modification of doctrine.

One of the most manifest changes of opinion wrought by sympathy was that concerning the salvation of infants who die without baptism. A few centuries ago, at the time of the Reformation, there was, we are told, only one man of note who taught the salvation of unbaptized infants. Calvin, Luther, and the great ones generally, held that all children of the heathen and so many of the children of Christians as were unbaptized were sent to endless punishment in hell. In the present day, so great has been the revulsion that all agree in the contrary doctrine. Practically, no one questions that all children are saved. What has wrought this great change in opinion? There is no more evidence now as to the destiny of unbaptized children than there was then. The change is due to the growth of tenderness for the little ones.

This single change of doctrine has reduced by one-half the number of those consigned to perdition—consigned by *men,* I mean, of course. And all people are glad of it.

The number of the lost is being still further reduced by both Roman Catholics and Protestants. Certain of the former have pointed out that the doctrine of "no salvation outside the Church" has been overstated. To begin with, the Church has made no such authoritative declaration as that salvation is limited to its own members. On the contrary, it has taught doctrines that seem to many to imply the salvation of great multitudes of non-Catholics.

As for Protestants, there is still to be heard on occasion a thoroughgoing expression of the old doctrine, but a more common opinion, even among conservatives, is reported in the words at-

tributed to Dr. Patton of Princeton. He said (according to report) that the number of the finally lost will probably be in about the proportion of those now confined in prison on earth. Dr. Briggs, who is reckoned somewhat less conservative, says that the number will be "inconsiderable." And it is by extending "probation" to the future world, as Luther did, or by some substitute for the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, that provision is made and opportunity is given for doing so much more than the church on earth can do.

Taking them together, there are in all churches a great number who have extreme opinions in this direction. Dr. Hensley Henson says: "We no longer really believe the appalling doctrines which fill our theology, endanger our creeds and linger in our ritual." The general liberality of the Anglican Church, which he represents, is well known. Some, like Dr. Gordon, state the subject hypothetically: "If God shall succeed, all will be saved." Some prefer the statement of Dr. Bradford, President of the General Convention of Congregationalists: "We know not, but we do not see how any one can hold out forever against God, when the fulness of his divine glory is revealed . . . . and therefore we *hope, as a duty.*"

In short there seem to be, among people in general, four states of mind with reference to this subject. The old doctrine of endless punishment still appears in some books; the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked has also many advocates; a large number are quite non-committal and do not know which way to turn; and, finally, there are many expressions of the larger hope. Among thoughtful Protestants in Germany, France, Great Britain, and America, it is not clear which one of the four states of mind is most largely represented—though in America there is no doubt that endless punishment is commonly taught, or at least held. But the number of those who are to be subjected to its discipline is no longer the great majority of the race; it is rather "the proportion of those now held in prison," or even some smaller estimate.

Concerning the state or condition of the lost, the change has been quite as thorough as concerning the number of them.

As long ago as St. Augustine's time, it was a common opinion in the Roman Catholic Church that punishments in hell are graded according to the offence, and that even intervals of rest or

mitigation of torments are occasionally allowed by a gracious act of pity on the part of God. And some have dared to suggest that, in process of time, the Supreme Judge may ordain that the mitigation shall become permanent.

In the strenuous days of the Reformation, however, and among the leading Protestants, no ray of compassion lighted up the darkness of their thoughts of the Pit. To the question whether the blessed in heaven will not be saddened by seeing their nearest and dearest ones tortured in hell, Luther answered: "Not the least in the world." Jonathan Edwards said: "The view of the misery of the damned will double the ardor of the love and gratitude of the saints in Heaven." Andrew Welwood thought: "The saints will be overjoyed in beholding the vengeance of God." Samuel Hopkins expressed the opinion that the sight of hell would be "most entertaining" to all those who love God, and would give them the highest and most ineffable pleasure. The great Dr. Bellamy capped the climax by an elaborate calculation, based on science and philosophy, in which he estimated that the happiness of the blessed in heaven would be increased 9,600,000,000 times on account of the misery of the damned.

After this, there was a reaction. Indeed, at the very time when men were saying such things, their own natures were beginning to protest against their theology. "Jonathan Edwards's congregation used to listen to him with tears and sighs and groans and beating of the breast, in sheer horror at his words; and the preacher himself was filled with anguish at the pictures of hell-torments which he conceived it his duty to set forth." "I sink under the weight of this subject," exclaimed Saurin, in his famous Sermon on Hell, "and find in the thought a mortal poison which diffuseth itself into every part of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, and life itself a cruel bitter." The revulsion, the beginnings of which good men felt in those days, has now, a century or two later, become itself a ruling element in theology. The pendulum has swung to the other extreme. The several forms of expression of this dominating principle remain now to be indicated.

First, we may notice (for passion and hyperbole beget their kind), that the former doctrines are now often condemned as criminal. Dr. Farrar, after detailing the opinions of certain men, some of which are quoted above, says:

"These wanton exercises of the imagination assume the aspect of deadly blasphemy against Him whose name is Love. . . . We can scarce refrain from the question which one has asked: 'What crimes of men can merit the endless tortures here set forth, except the crime of conceiving such tortures, and ascribing the malice of their influence to an all-wise and holy God?' . . . The belief in such horrors and blasphemies is the worst enemy of the faith and the immediate parent of atheism, of wretchedness, and of despair."

Dr. Briggs says:

"The preachers preach the damnation of the heathen; and the hearers hear and accept. But they do not believe it in their hearts. If they did they would be more worthy of damnation than the heathen themselves—unless they should at once give their whole lives and their property to the missionary cause."

Long ago, John Wesley had said, "Calvin's God is my Devil!" and now there are many who say the same of Wesley's God. And these new opinions are expressed, not merely by Universalists and Unitarians, but by members of orthodox or conservative churches—who alone are here quoted.

Another form of reaction is that of those who, while they are aware that the anticipation of future torments has been overworked as a motive in religion, yet do not so vividly realize the offensiveness of the old doctrines, and are therefore inclined merely so far as to shun the subject of future punishment. R. W. Dale said:

"The traditional theory of the endlessness of sin and suffering has lost its authority. . . . The appeal to fear is being silently dropped."

One writer says that in his theological seminary the subject of hell, being the last in the course of theology, was never reached in the class-room, and therefore never really studied by the young men; and afterwards they seldom mention the subject in their pulpits. For some reason, most theologians habitually shrink from declaring themselves on questions relating to the future state. It seems true also that those who have outgrown both the excessive appeal to fear and the reaction to silence, who have reached a golden mean of rational use of fear as a motive, are rather to be found with the liberals than in the regular and orthodox communions.

Lyman Abbott has said that some of the most vigorous pre-

sentations of the severity of God's judgment are those which are spoken from Universalist pulpits. And it is related that, a few years ago, a distinguished conservative official was sending out a missionary, and "charged" him with these words: "Whatever you do, do not preach hell-fire; preach the love of God." On the other hand, in a neighboring Divinity School of the liberal order, the students are advised to learn the language of anathema (in which they have not been brought up), by reading such works as Jonathan Edwards's sermon on "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," "that you may know how to preach the awfulness of sin and the terrors of hell." It seems that the thoroughgoing liberals have matured their convictions, and have established due relations with the facts of moral government; while the conservatives are yet in transition, and being somewhat under the influence of terrible anticipations, they have, in many cases at least, fled too far away from the objects of their fear.

In other words there are in the church at large many excellent spirits who have so vigorously reacted against the excesses of past theology as to lose sight of the truth there was in it. When, therefore, with a holy zeal derived from their spiritual ancestry, they preach the new dominating principle of love towards even sinners in hell, they weaken their cause, by understating or even quite overlooking the fact of the severity of God as manifested in what we know from experience of his moral government.

This tendency is illustrated in a multitude of expressions; though we must here confine attention to a few samples which may indicate the state of opinion. To begin with the more moderate, there was at least a glimmer of new light in Cardinal Newman's phrase: "Penalty is ordained as a *good* in itself." And many have accepted such a conception as Dr. Fairbairn's (if a newspaper report be correct), that "the love of God forbids both endless punishment and annihilation of the wicked"; or Dr. Farrar's, that "retribution in this world and in the next is both merciful and just." New ideas, however, begin to be manifest when Dr. Samuel Harris of Yale declares that "God is as benevolent in punishing as He is in saving"—in other words, He is as benevolent in hell as He is in heaven.

But even these words only begin to indicate the extent and quality of God's tenderness towards sinners, as taught by a considerable number of the leaders of theology to-day in England

and America. Something of their mode of thought may be shown by such a sample as follows. It is argued that Christ, "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," is a perfect representative of God to us, and therefore God is Himself a being of sorrows and grief; and that Christ came for the purpose of declaring this unto men. For the nature of love is to suffer with the beloved. It is love that "suffereth long . . . . beareth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things," and it is therefore the greatest of all things. Therefore, says Dr. A. H. Strong: "Christ always suffers with us. He (who is God) began to suffer when the first sin was committed; and he will always suffer so long as men sin" here or hereafter. Apparently, all the pains of hell are, by sympathy, God's own pains, as truly as man's. The "endless torment" of man will be the endless torment of God also. The doctrine of a suffering God is an old one, in some of its aspects, but here its import is newly realized; and it seems to reach certain chords of the human heart that vibrate to no other touch.

Naturally, the theory as to the quality of the punishment in hell is adapted to this view of the temper of God. As everybody knows, the notion of literal fire in hell has long since disappeared; and even expressions to the effect that the "figurative" fire (if we may so call it) will be more terrible than the literal, are not often heard or are modified by associated ideas. Thus Roman Catholics teach that the essence of eternal punishment is the loss of the "Beatific Vision" of God. But we must suppose that evil men are rather glad to lose that vision than otherwise. Indeed, according to the Church a large number of those who "suffer" this loss are perfectly happy according to their nature, and (in Mivart's words) "they no more desire to change their state than oysters desire to become butterflies."

But not to speak further of the Roman Catholics, who are probably not great offenders in this regard, I call special attention to the Protestants who, for a positive doctrine of punishment, put forward such as the following from Dr. Dale:

> "By sin we forfeit our access to God through Christ, and are left in appalling loneliness and desolation. . . . The supreme penalty of sin is the loss of our original and ideal relation to God."

But this kind of penalty is just what the sinner likes. He prefers to be left alone by God, he wishes to be rid of the "original

and ideal relation to God." If you hold up to him such consequences of sin, you hold up only an additional attraction of sin.

I am far from pretending that these expressions are the only ones used by the authorities, but rather that, by their prominence in modern preaching, supported as they are by associated ideas, and uncorrelated with certain indubitable facts of moral law, they form an insufficient support of moral and spiritual life. The old ideas being laid aside, or if used being discounted by the hearers because they are ungenuine, and the new ideas being fragmentary, "half-baked" (as the metaphor is), there is no spiritual food adequate to sustain a vigorous religious life.

Once, in former days, when a strenuous preacher waxed eloquent on the severity of God, a cry of pain came up from the pews: "Oh, Dr. Emmons, Dr. Emmons, has God then no pity at all?" So in these days, one is often moved to cry out, Has God then no justice at all?

In short the New Hell is often made so pleasant that it is liable to be chosen by bad men as a place of residence. Its inhabitants will not long be "an insignificant few;" "emigration will surely set that way" whenever the character of the climate shall become generally known.

The thing to be desired as a remedy for the backboneless condition of some modern theology, is not unlike the good old orthodox doctrine of fear and the sense of justice executed—lest hell become like some of our "reform prisons," which, by unintelligent zeal in goodness, are made so comfortable and honorable as to fail of the purpose of prisons. Perhaps, indeed, there is evidence that the limits of excess are already reached. For a large number of the liberal orthodox, while their sympathies are fully alive, and they preach God's infinite tenderness in dealing with offenders, yet also as plainly and forcibly declare His equal and exact justice, the certainty of retribution in this world and in the next. Intelligence and conscience may be trusted to do the rest; that is, on the one hand, to clarify the doctrine with reference to mischievous associations, and, on the other, to fill out its meaning and give it definite expression, and thus to set forth a proper and efficient conception of divine government.

G. T. KNIGHT.

THE SON OF ROYAL LANGBRITH.

BY WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS.

PART VII.

XXX.

LIFE is never the logical and consequent thing we argue from the moral and intellectual premises. There ought always to be evident reason in it; but such reason as it has is often crossed and obscured by perverse events, which, in our brief perspective, give it the aspect of a helpless craze. Obvious effect does not follow obvious cause; there is sometimes no perceptible cause for the effects we see. The law that we find at work in the material world is, apparently, absent from the moral world; not, imaginably, because it is without law, but because the law is of such cosmical vastness in its operation that it is only once or twice sensible to any man's experience. The seasons come and go in orderly course, but the incidents of human life have not the orderly procession of the seasons; so far as the sages or the saints are able convincingly to affirm, they have only the capricious vicissitude of weather.

Anther had been in charge of Hawberk's case for twenty years; and, though he had always forbidden himself to despair of it, he had long ceased to hope for any final cure. He was used to changes for the better and changes for the worse in Hawberk's habit, and to the psychological consequences when he limited his indulgence and when he lapsed again into his debauch. Under it all, though the man's character was deteriorated or ameliorated, his temperament remained fundamentally the same, and Anther had never ceased to feel the charm of his gayety and his goodness, which, as they reappeared in Hope charmed and deeply touched him. Hawberk's recovery had become personally indifferent to him, so far as it concerned the hopes he had once built upon it; but the girl's joy in it gave poignancy to the fears that had replaced his hopes. In a reasonable forecast of the effect, Hawberk must return in his self-restoration to a full sense of the reality concerning the wrong done him by Langbrith; and in place of the delusion he had promoted in the helpless mendacity of his habit, he must know and speak the truth. There had already been hints of such an eventuality: hints that sickened Anther in the thought of the time

Copyright, 1903, by Harper & Brothers. All Rights Reserved.

when he would have welcomed them, and that made him tremble for the misery which the truth must bring upon Hope, through her love for the man whose father had so pitilessly wronged her own. Anther had believed that he wanted justice done. This had been his argument with Judge Garley; it had been his suggestion to Dr. Enderby. It ought to avail him in any emergency, but now it did not avail him, and he accused himself of having cared for the truth only in his own interest, as the truth would have promoted it with Mrs. Langbrith against her son.

What did avail him in the course he must pursue was his sense of professional duty; amidst all the moral confusion, that was clear. He ought to have no question but of the recovery of his patient, and he tried to fix his mind upon this, and not let it stray to any question of consequences. He did his best to keep his study of the case physiological, and not to concern himself with those psychological aspects which Hawberk himself found more interesting, and which he was fond of turning to the light in his visits to his physician. With his escape from the terrors of his opium nightmares, he found a philosophic pleasure in noting facts from which even the physician was aware of shrinking.

Once, toward the end of summer, when they had been "taking stock," as Hawberk called it, of his symptoms, and he was exulting in the reduction of his laudanum to the equivalent of three grains of morphine a day, he said: "The most curious thing about it is that I seem to be doing a sort of Rip Van Winkle act, and waking out of a dream of twenty years or so. It's a dream that's been going on steadily all the while that those little one-horse nightmares have been cavorting round, with green dwarfs on their backs, and playing the devil generally; and this steady dream has had a good genius in it that I'm beginning to have my doubts about, now that I'm waking up. It seems to me that Royal Langbrith wasn't such a friend of mine as I've been trying to make out. What do you think? Or did I put this up on you once before?"

"Not just in so many words."

"Well, I wasn't certain. Royal Langbrith seems to have a better grip as a good genius when I've been dipping into the laudanum pretty freely, than he does when I've kept to the medicine and the tonics. I have my ups and downs about him. But what do *you* think of him in the capacity of a good genius?"

"As I told you before, Hawberk, that's something you've got to work out for yourself."

"And if I've worked it out that he was an infernal scoundrel, and was ready to say so, what are the chances that folks would believe it?"

"The chances would be against you, with your past as an opium-eater."

"They could say it was another of my pipe-dreams?"

"You would have to bring the strongest sort of proof."

"With every one?"

"What makes you think now that you were mistaken about him before?"

"Look here, Doct' Anther, what do *you* think about Royal Langbrith?"

Anther suddenly perceived that he had a duty toward Hawberk not contained in the duty of a physician to his patient: the duty one has to a man whom one knows to have been wronged. "I?" he hesitated. Then he plunged. "*I* think he was an infernal scoundrel!"

Hawberk laughed, queerly. "Don't you *know* he was?"

"Yes, I *know* he was." The truth was open between them, and each was astonished at the effect the open truth had on himself.

"What," Hawberk parleyed, with a smile as queer as his laugh, "should you say we'd ought to do about it?"

"I don't know," Anther candidly avowed. "Once I should have known."

"So should I." And now Hawberk roared with pleasure. "But I guess that devil has *got* us now. I've seen the time when I wanted to go into the cemetery and dig him up and burn him, but I don't know as I do now. What do you say, Doct' Anther? Let bygones be bygones, as the fellow said about his old debts when he started in to make some new ones? Still, it does gravel me when I think of that tablet in the front of the library. I was looking at it as I came along down. Kind of pathetic, too, when you think of Jim. How did they ever keep him in the dark about his father?"

"It happened naturally enough. It rested with his mother; and, when the time came for him to know the facts, the time for her to tell them was past."

"I see. A good deal as it is with me now. You might almost say that devil had planned it out to have his boy make it up with my girl, so as to stop my mouth for good and all. First off, after I lost my wife, I used to think I should like to make him suffer for the lies he threatened me with. I wanted to kill him. Well, what's the use? Somehow, I don't feel that way now. I don't want to revenge myself, and I don't believe she'd want me to revenge her. Curious!" Hawberk reflected, with a pause, in view of the interesting predicament. After a while, he said, "How that devil must have chuckled when he saw me up there, with the other leading citizens that day, dedicating that tablet to his memory! But, Doct' Anther, there's something I can't get through me. I can understand why *I* should be there. *I* was game for anything, when I was filled up with laudanum; but I don't see how you came to be celebrating the life, death, and Christian sufferings of Royal Langbrith. Never did *you* any harm, did he?"

"Not while he lived," Anther said.

"Kind of fetched you a back-hander from the grave? Well, I don't want to ask you what it was, but I should like to ask how you

came, knowing all you did about him, to let Judge Garley and Dr. Enderby in for their share in the proceedings. They any notion of the peculiar virtues of the deceased?"

A painful flush overspread Anther's face. "I felt it my duty to tell Judge Garley as soon as I found that the scheme had taken shape in James's mind, and he held the legal view of it. He was duly warned, and I have nothing to blame myself with there. I don't feel so easy about Dr. Enderby. I am afraid I let a personal motive influence me in withholding the truth from him until it was practically too late for him to withdraw. I can't decide how much he wished to spare me in arriving at the conclusion he did. He agreed substantially with Garley that no good could come of exposing Langbrith at this late day, and much harm might come. Besides, James was to be considered."

"Ah!" Hawberk said. "That's where *I* come in. What about James? Hadn't he ought to know about it? Hadn't I ought to have it out with him before he marries a daughter of mine?"

"Dr. Enderby thought that no one should tell him now; that no one could, without interfering with the order of Providence, without forcing God's purposes, as he put it. The truth could come out fully only when it could come out naturally, necessarily, inevitably."

Hawberk fetched a long, deep sigh of relief. "Well, that lets me out. I was feeling my way in that direction, I guess. I guess Doct' Enderby is right. Any rate, I'm going to let the thing rest for the present. I'm satisfied with what I've got. It wouldn't help me any, and it wouldn't help Hope, if the whole thing was out. Let the damned thing be, *I* say, and that's what I understand Doct' Enderby says: maybe not just in the same words. I don't know as I should exactly want Hope to marry Jim Langbrith, without he had been told something about it—say enough to understand that there wa'n't any flies on me when I was put out. That's only fair to Hope; I don't care for myself. But if there's an order of Providence, I'm willing to wait for the procession. Yes, I'm willing to wait and see if there *is* any procession. If there ain't, it'll be time enough to start one. Well, Doct' Anther," Hawberk said, putting out his hand to the doctor as he rose, "I don't want to holler before I'm out of the woods, but as far as I'm a judge, you've saved me, body and soul. I don't know how you feel, but I should be glad to swap my feelings for yours, whatever they are. Yes," and Hawberk broke down with his laugh from the height of sentiment he had reached; "I don't know but I'd be willing to swap Royal Langbrith's feelings for yours, this minute."

Anther could not refuse to join in his laugh, but he felt it right to put in a word of caution. "We mustn't brag about your case. But I'll say that I've hopes of you that I never had before. It now rests with you, mainly. If we pull through together, I'll be glad to swap feelings with you. We won't say anything about Langbrith; he mightn't be willing to trade."

"Not without some boot, you may bet," Hawberk shouted, with supreme joy in the joke, as he went out of the doctor's door, where the doctor stood looking after him, not unhappy for himself, as he ought logically to have been in contrasting his hopeless life with the life that was beginning anew so hopefully for Hawberk, and with something of the peace that passes understanding in his heart.

XXXI.

John Langbrith continued to talk of going away. Upon the inspiration of meeting an old acquaintance whom he asked where he had been keeping himself of late, and who answered that he had been in Japan, John Langbrith began to think of going round the world, as a little experimental journey, since a man could go to Japan and back without being noticed. He asked Anther what he thought of circumnavigating the globe as a remedy for nervous dyspepsia, and the doctor told him he did not think it would be bad. Then John Langbrith said he had half a notion to go out to Paris, and see James; there had never been much affection between them, but John Langbrith considered that James could get him a comfortable boarding-place, where he could stay while he was picking out some German spring to go to more permanently. He asked Anther if he did not think some of those German springs would be good for him. Again Anther said that he did not think it would be bad; and this suggested giving Saratoga a trial. John Langbrith could go to Saratoga for a week before the season ended, and he shaped his business so that he could put it in the hands of a young subordinate, with instructions to reach him by telegraph if needed, for he could return at a second's notice; and he actually went. At Saratoga he drank impartially of all the waters, at all hours of the day, without regard to diet, and came home worse, if anything, than he went, but somehow with a sense of renewed energy.

He took hold with so much force that, before the snow flew, he had, as he phrased it to Anther, got round to a little back of where he started. Then the doctor indulged a sentiment of something like poetic justice, in suggesting a means of relief for John Langbrith from one side of his work, and of benefit for another patient.

"Why don't you split up your responsibility?" he asked. "Shoulder the business half yourself, and let Hawberk look after the manufacturing. He needs something to help keep him out of mischief, and he is able now to take hold of the paper-making and run it as well as ever he did. He hasn't forgotten how to use his own inventions, I guess."

John Langbrith's jaundiced eyes emitted a yellow light of appreciative relish. "Lord! Make Royal turn in his grave—what there's left of him *to* turn! Do you mean to say you could put any dependence on Hawberk?"

"Why not? It would be merely a mechanical exercise of his faculties, and it would occupy him and keep his mind off the opium."

"Lord!" John Langbrith said again; and after a moment's muse, he said, "Send him round," and so took himself away with a galvanic activity that supported him in his automatic progress toward the mills.

Hawberk had much the same sardonic pleasure as Langbrith had shown at the notion of his being re-instated in his old charge; but it was sweetened to something better by the virtues of temperament in him. "Now, Hope," he bade his daughter, after the first day's experiment had justified the confidence with which he entered on his work, "you write to James about this. He'll like to hear about it, and he'll like to hear about it from *you*. And you tell him it was Doct' Anther's idea. He'd ought to like that, too, and the doctor'd ought to have the credit of it, anyway. If I should make a slump, later on, I'll take the credit of *that*. But I guess there ain't going to *be* any slump."

The few spectators of Hawberk's experiment who could witness it with a fully comprehensive intelligence of the case, regarded it according to their respective natures. To the community at large, it had the interest of something miraculous—something between rising from the dead and returning cured from an inebriate asylum. If anything could have rendered Hawberk a more dramatically notable member of society than he had been as an opium-eater of twenty-five years' standing, it was his novel quality of reformed opium-eater. This gave him a claim upon the wonder of every stranger who came to Saxmills, and it conferred the right on every citizen to point him out to the sojourner in his going and coming. This fascination of the fact extended itself to Hope, when she happened to be seen, and to the house where the Hawberks lived.

The general belief was, that the thing would not last; and this was the particular belief of Judge Garley, who owned his scepticism to Dr. Anther, with some tendency to an amiable criticism of Anther's share in the affair. He had seen so little of reform, in his acquaintance with the law, he said, that he was shy of it wherever he saw it. But he was willing to give it time; it never took much time. Perhaps, though, he suggested, this was a case not so much under the law as under the gospel. If that was so, he would like to know if the doctor really believed in the supernatural.

"No," Anther said, "only in the natural." And this was, substantially, the answer which he opposed to Mrs. Enderby's secret wistfulness regarding a fact which she beheld as with clasped hands, uncertain how, as a church-woman, she ought to feel toward miracles post-dating those of Scripture. She would have liked to feel the hand of God in the tardy and partial retribution of a man cruelly wronged; and it is doubtful if she thought the rector quite level with his spiritual opportunities in his preference of Dr. Anther's theory, that the unexpected was one of the things always to be looked for in the practice of medicine. What measurably consoled her was the tender seriousness of her husband in the whole matter—

the brotherly affection which he showed Hawberk in the relation which he was able to form with him, as a man doing a man's part in the world's work after long uselessness, and the delicacy with which he forebore to recognize that there was anything novel in this performance of duty by Hawberk. She was peculiarly touched when he proposed that they should have Hope and her father to supper, and she promised that she should be forever ashamed that she had let her husband think of it first.

Mrs. Enderby atoned, as far as she could, by asking Mrs. Langbrith and Dr. Anther, but neither of them could come, and she wasn't sorry that they had the Hawberks alone; with retrospective prevision she perceived that anything else would have been overdoing it. She found Hawberk very entertaining. He talked frankly of getting back to his old work in the mill, and he tried to make her understand an invention he had hopes of perfecting for the "Dandy Roll," as he called it, so that the water-marking of paper could be done at an immense saving of time and money. He explained to her that the words, or designs, to be water-marked had now to be put in by hand with bits of fine wire, and sewed on a cylinder with fine metallic thread; but he was trying to make a Dandy Roll on which the design could be changed as easily as if it were a section of type in a printer's form. It was very luminous while he talked, but it all faded away afterwards, and left in Mrs. Enderby's intelligence only the words "Dandy Roll," which had a queer fascination, together with a sense of Hawberk's dignity and enthusiasm about it.

Hope was gay, as always; but it seemed to Mrs. Enderby that she was not so gay as she had sometimes seen her, when she had far less reason to be so. There was a shadow of anxiety in her beauty which Mrs. Enderby wondered never to have found there before, and a sound of anxiety in her lovely tones unheard before. She thought she could see the girl closely following all her father did and said; but perhaps it was only the effect in her of hopes not cherished till now, naturally betraying themselves in anxieties. As a matter of fact, Hope had no reason to feel anything but joy in her father's restoration to his old usefulness. There was no poison of a gratified vengeance in her heart, for it was agreed almost tacitly between Hawberk and Anther that no good could come of her knowing, for the present at least, the outrage of the past. "Time enough," her father had gone so far as to say, "for Hope to be brought into all that when we see that it's got to come out generally. I don't know as I should feel just right about letting her keep on with Jim, if she was one to blame a man for what she has to suffer instead of for what he has done. Any rate, till we see our way to telling Jim, I guess we'd better keep dark with Hope, heigh?"

Whatever might have been the full mind of Dr. Anther, he assented to Hawberk's decision, though he had to hold to it against

counter reasoning that searched his deeper nature or his complexer conscience. It was not finally strange to him that this reasoning should have come from one whose peace was more intimately involved than that of any one but Hope herself. Anther must long ago, if it had not been for his tenderness of her, have owned that Mrs. Langbrith had shown a moral cowardice concerning her son, which was hardly less than a culpable weakness; but he defended her to himself, because he perceived that weakness could never be culpable. He might as well blame any of the feeble creatures which she made him think of for not being strong, and he was not ready with praise for the unexpected force which she showed, where he took her weakness for granted. He merely reflected that he had not taken into account the pity of women for women, when one of them has been able to put herself perfectly in another's place, and to ignore in behalf of their sex's helplessness the other claims of nature. A sense of this awed him at Mrs. Langbrith's refusal to acquiesce in Hawberk's notion of what was best to be done in regard to Hope. At first, she had seemed to acquiesce in it, as something that superiorly concerned the father and the daughter. Then one day, suddenly, she went to Anther, and, not finding him, she left a message of peremptory entreaty for him; and they found themselves together, in the early falling twilight of an autumn day, in the dim parlor where their middle-aged drama had already seemed to play itself out.

"I can't let this go on, Dr. Anther," she said, traversing any pretense of greeting between them when he appeared. "Mr. Hawberk is making a mistake. Hope ought to *know*. She ought to be *told*. James is his father's *son*. He may be *like* him. He may make his wife suffer what his father made me suffer. How do we know what he is doing there in Paris, now?"

She was a woman of few words, and in these few she had compacted her suspicions, her reasons, her conclusions; and, though she pressed them upon Anther with hysterical nervousness, he had to respect the sense there was in them, as well as the anguish there was behind them.

He could only parley, for a beginning. "He is *your* son, too, Amelia."

"And what if he is?" she retorted. "What is *me* in him will be crushed out by what is *him* in him," and Anther saw that she had thought it better than she could speak it, though but for her erring grammar it was spoken well enough.

He said, "I should not fear for her in her marriage with James. She is a stronger character than he."

"That was what I said when I began to think of it. But the weakest man can make the strongest woman suffer things worse than death; and I don't care whether there would be any suffering or not. There would be wrong. She has a right to know. Her father has no right to keep her from knowing. Why, it's wicked!

What will she think, what will he say if she doesn't find it out till afterwards?"

"He can say that he didn't know himself. She will not blame him, at any rate."

"That isn't enough. She has got to have the right to say now she will not marry the son of such a man. Will you tell her?"

Anther reflected. "No, Amelia," he said, "I don't think that I will tell her."

"Why?"

"Because I have only the relation of her father's physician to her. If I could have had another relation to her," and Mrs. Langbrith winced at the implication, so that he felt sorry for it, "I might have been justified in telling her. As it is, I don't."

"Well, then," Mrs. Langbrith said, desperately, "*I* will tell her."

"Before you tell *him*?"

The question daunted her; it was necessary, but he realized its cruelty as well as its necessity. She gasped inarticulately; the unfalling tears started into her eyes. She had, as he saw, reached the limit of her small strength. It must be days or weeks, possibly months, before she could gather force for a new effort.

Anther tried to say something consoling to her; he succeeded only in saying something compassionate, which did not avail. "You have taken away my chance," she said, and he would not take from her the slight stay she found in her resentment.

XXXII.

Anther noted in himself, with curious interest, the accomplished adjustment of the spirit to circumstances that once seemed impossible, and the acceptance of conditions which before had been intolerable. He had gone on to the end of a certain event, strongly willing and meaning something which then he no longer willed or meant. With a sense of acquiescent surprise he found himself at peace with desires and purposes that had long afflicted him with unrest, and it was not they, apparently, that differed, but himself. To the young this will be a mystery, but to those no longer young it will be of the quality of many experiences which, if still mysterious, are not more so than the whole texture of existence.

He had foregone a hope that had seemed essential to his life, but that, once foregone, was like other things outlived—like something of years ago, of his early manhood, almost of his boyhood. He was still baffled and disappointed, but he perceived that he did not care, did not suffer, as he supposed he should care and suffer. It was his compensation that what was ignoble in his regret was gone from it. Neither resentment nor the selfish sense of loss tinged it. Primarily, his regret was hardly for himself; and he perceived that, so far as it concerned another, it was mixed with a sense of escape from anxiety, from fears which the fulfilment of his hopes would have perpetuated. He realized more and more that he had been

having to do with weakness, and he realized this not in contempt of weakness, but in the compassion which was the constant lesson of his calling. He blamed Mrs. Langbrith, in her shrinking from collision with her son's will, no more than he would have blamed any timorous creature for seeking to shun a physical ordeal to which it was unequal. He had, at least, learned patience and mercy from his acquaintance with disease; and he had learned to distinguish between what was disease and what was an innate fault which no drugs, either for the soul or body, could medicine.

What surprised him and, when it first suggested itself, shocked him, was a sort of reason, which was not an excuse, for Royal Langbrith in the defect which he realized. Given such a predatory nature as his, was it not in the order of things that there should be another nature formed for his prey? Must not the very helplessness of his victim have been the irresistible lure of his cruelty? We are not masters of those vagaries, good or evil, that fill the mind after its disoccupation by direct purposes; and Anther did not seriously blame himself for their wild play. He broke this up and banished the vagaries sometimes by calling to his help things that he ought to think of, or by confronting them with the woman they wronged and so rendered the more tenderly dear to him.

She was, in fact, never more tenderly dear to him than now, when he had abandoned the hope, almost the wish, of making her his wife. She had been a wife long ago, and yet he began to feel a sort of profanation in the idea of making her a wife. The time came when Anther wondered whether he had ever really felt a passion for her, such as even in middle life a man may feel for a woman, and whether, in that embrace into which they had once been surprised, there was any love other than the affection of a brother and sister, drawn heart to heart in a moment of supreme emotion. At such a time he made entire excuse for James Langbrith, and accounted for him as forgivingly as for her. If her son had instinctively the feeling which had tardily worked itself out in Anther's consciousness, then, surely, it was not the son whom he could blame. One hints at cognitions which refuse anything more positive than intimation, and which can have no proof in the admissions of those who deal conventionally with their own consciences. It was because Anther was not one of these that he was a nature of exceptional type, and because he could accept the logic of his self-knowledge that he was a character of rare strength. He was strong enough not only to forgive the frantic boy who had insulted and outraged him in his pain, but to feel a share in the error which had kept him in ignorance of the truth. It was not the less his right to know this because there had never been the moment to make it known to him. Anther realized that the boy had been deeply injured, and he accepted his own share of the retribution as the just penalty of his share in the error. He saw, too late, that it was his weakness not to have overruled the weakness which he

spared the supreme ordeal. He promised himself, somehow, sometime, to make good to James Langbrith the wrong he had suffered.

In this self-promise, after the experience which had stirred his life to its depths, he found a limpid peace from which his dream of passion hung retreatingly aloof, like a cloud broken and drifting away. He had a gayety of heart for which he did not logically account, but in which he felt the power of consoling and supporting the weakness he had once imagined protecting through a husband's rights. When he first saw Mrs. Langbrith after his tacit renunciation, much more real than that explicit renunciation which preceded it, he was aware of an apprehension in her which it was not for words to quiet. By what he forebore, he must make her know that he had ceased to think of her as he had thought, and that she was as safe from the pursuit of what had been his love as from the reproach which he would never join her in making herself.

They talked of Hope and Langbrith, and of the reason there was in believing that it might be safe for the girl to trust her father to himself, if James wished it, before very long. Mrs. Langbrith did not know directly of her son's plans and purposes. Apparently, the communication between them was formal and restricted, and she spoke of what was in her mind rather because of the girl than of him. In an involuntary measurement of her interest with his own, it appeared to Anther that it was he who was the more concerned for James Langbrith; and it was with surprise that he saw she really did not understand him at first when he said, "I wish he could be assured that, when he comes home, there will be no question of its being the same home to him that it has always been."

"I don't know what you mean," she returned.

"I really believe you don't," he said, musingly, with his unselfish gaze on her. "Well," he explained, "that he need not be afraid of my making a difference in it."

"Oh!" she evaded whatever challenge she might have fancied in the words, "he will have a home of his own. Dr. Anther," she continued, "I don't know what you'll think of me, but I don't feel the same towards James that I used to. I can't make it out, exactly, but should you think it was wicked if I had changed so that I did not care for him so much? When I was a child I was that way, if ever they made me do what I didn't want to do, and didn't make me see the reason. I remember it about my mother once, when I was quite little. I had to do what she made me, but after that she wasn't the same to me. It is so with James, now. He is not the same to me. I don't want to punish him for it, but he is not the same. I don't know whether I explain it."

"Yes, I think you do."

"And do you blame me?"

"No, but I think you may change again towards him." She

shook her head doubtfully. "You're one of those who need to get back their strength when they have been tried."

His pitying intelligence was very sweet to her. "If I tried to say what I thought of *you*,—" she began.

"Don't try," he said, simply, and she did not.

She said, "I don't like to think how you have to live there in that way, taking your meals out, and your house so uncomfortable."

"Is it uncomfortable? I don't notice those things very much. I like going to the hotel; it gives variety, and it seems to me I don't get things so cold as I did with Mrs. Burwell."

She gave a housekeeper's sigh of compassion, but she said, from a higher feeling, "I know why you bought it."

"Yes, I told you. But that's all past now."

"Why is it past?" she demanded, almost resentfully. "Do you think I've changed towards you, too, Dr. Anther?"

"No, I don't, Amelia. I believe you're just what you always were towards me."

"Then, if it's all past, as you say, it must be you that have changed."

"No. I am the same, too."

She looked at him with a wistfulness which he knew to be entreaty of him for that strength to give herself to him which she did not feel in her own will.

"If you say so," she tried her courage, "I will do it now—to-morrow—to-day, if you say so. I told you that James took back what he said; that he was willing. At any rate, what is the use? He can never feel right to me after this, no matter what I do. I know him—he can't forgive the hurt to his pride."

"It was a hurt to something better than his pride," Anther said, justly.

"No matter. It's something he can't forgive me and I don't care. You're more than James is, and now he doesn't want me—he won't need me. If you ask me now to marry you, I will."

He believed that he saw in her the little maximum of her force, which perhaps spent itself in the words, and would have nothing left for the deed. The deed must be altogether his. In the sweetness that welled up in his soul from the consciousness of perfectly comprehending, not her intention merely, but her nature, he was happier than the fulfilment of his hopes could once have made him.

"Do you say that, Amelia, because you wish it or because you think I do?"

"I want to do everything that you want me to."

"Then I don't want you to do this, my dear. I know you will understand me. I don't believe we ought to get married."

"Because James—?"

"He has nothing to do with it, now. Because we can be more to each other if we remain as we are."

She looked bewilderedly at him, but he believed that he saw in her the relief that weakness intimates to one who forbears demand upon it. She had fulfilled her impulse, and spent all her force on it. She was not hurt, either in her vanity or affection. He could see, indeed, that she trusted him too entirely for such an effect.

"Then," she said, in simple abeyance to his judgment, "Will you let me do anything for you that I think you need?"

"What is there that I need?" he parried her question. "I am very well as I am. I assure you that I am quite as I wish to be. I don't feel what seems to you discomfort, and after this understanding, that has no misunderstanding in it, I shall feel happier about you than I have ever felt. If I didn't believe you would rather live your life alone, or if I could believe you wanted me to join mine with it for any help I could give, you know I would make you do what you have offered to let me. But I believe the one thing, and I don't believe the other. I know you're wanting to put yourself under my will to sacrifice yourself to me.

"No!"

"Yes, it is so. If you ever want my help or counsel or friendship, you know it is always here for you, as fully and freely as if I were your husband—perhaps more so. At any rate, I should not exact anything in return, for I need nothing!"

"But if you ever do need anything—me or anything I can do—will you promise—promise—"

"Oh, yes, I will ask you. I promise you that."

Nothing seems final in human experience, and neither of these two who now parted really accepted the conclusion to which they had come as the last word in their affair. It was to be held in that sort of solution in which all human affairs are held, until that happens which can alone precipitate them. She went on with the life to which alone she was, perhaps, equal. She was, at any rate, inveterately used to its abnegations, if they were abnegations; and he did the daily duties which were always full of interest and had the variety which keeps men from stagnating. He had not falsely pretended that he liked meeting the new people he met at the hotel, and he was richer in old companionships than most men of his age. The new people, it must be confessed, were oftenest the commercial travellers whose enterprises brought them to Saxmills. But, to a man who took other men as unconventionally as he offered himself, they were less typical and more personal than they are in common acceptance. The younger ones might be noisy in manner, and over-jocular with one another at table and in the hotel office, where Anther sometimes paused for a moment of digestion after his meals, before driving off on his calls. But with the old fellow, whose bounds they did not try to traverse, they were quiet and gentle. When they had identified him, through the landlord, they liked to ask him if there was much sickness around. Now

and then, one submitted a malady of his own to Anther, and took his medicine with a deferential inquiry whether the doctor thought smoking hurt a man. Now and then, there was a young family man among them, who was homesick for his wife and babies. The older family men liked the quiet of Anther's willing talk, and put before him their own philosophic conjectures and conclusions about life in general. Of their own sort of life they were confessedly tired, but what, at their time of day, could a man do? If they could get hold of a piece of land near a good market, they would be all right. What about abandoned farms in that neighborhood?

Among the transients, there happened people who had chanced stopping at Saxmills, because they had a fancy for seeing what such a place was like. They were people of independent tastes, from some of the larger cities, and of æsthetic occupations or none, who brought the waft of a larger life and the eagerness of a sympathetic intelligence. There was once an elderly couple from the West, who, after sparely owning that they were originally from this part of the country, developed into pilgrims to the old homestead of one or other of them, which they thought of buying back and fixing up for a summer place, if they could get the children to see it the same way. More than once there was a young couple, still in the flush of immediate marriage, who were breaking their wedding journey to Portland or Montreal or Boston, and were first diffident and then confident of Anther's good-will in his approaches to their acquaintance.

Besides all these, there were regular boarders, as the bank cashier and his wife, somewhat arid financial and social types; and that young and foolish matron who seldom fails, in any village community, to supply food for general reflection, and who, in the idleness of the hotel, where her young husband, a travelling man, had left her, amuses herself by wearing a white yachting-cap and a toothpick about the verandas, and varying her monotonous leisure by buggy-rides with a merchant of the place old enough to behave better.

Anther liked to drop in on Judge Garley of a late afternoon, when he commonly found the jurist reading a novel; he preferred the translations of French novels, which he devoured insatiably, but was as fond, in another way, of scientific tracts, such as he found in the mustard-colored Humboldt series; he liked psychology in any sort and size. With Anther he had always a certain effect of consideration, as one to whom, if not apology, tenderness was due, because of his peculiarities of temperament. The Langbrith incident remained closed between them, and there was no reason for Anther to believe that Garley had any misgivings as to his own attitude in it. Such spare reference to that business as Anther permitted himself was in his talk with Dr. Enderby, whom he fancied of an uneasy mind concerning it, and with whom he had a humane interest in administering the anodyne of his own final peace. It was,

in fact, from the rector's reasoning to the conclusion he had reached before, that Anther was most helpful to his friend; Enderby himself was never so much satisfied with being in the right, as sure that he was right in what he had done. It was one of those experiences, he once owned, that intimate a less perfect adjustment of the moral elements in this life than we may hope for in the life hereafter; as if the earthly materials of conduct were cruder and coarser than the spirit which dealt with them, and which was attuned to finer issues of behavior. Occasionally, he asked if Anther knew anything of James Langbrith's immediate purposes, and if he might be expected to return at all soon. He betrayed that he was not at rest with regard to Langbrith's unwittingly making another a sharer in the responsibilities which he must some day assume towards the past.

Mrs. Enderby kept herself as fully instructed as possible from Hope as to the future of the young people, and if she partook of her husband's uneasiness, she did not show it. Perhaps, in that optimistic view of marriage which some of the best women take voluntarily, if not instinctively, she looked forward to that as the panacea of whatever ills life had in store for them. Of course, she allowed, Hope ought somehow to know the truth before she committed herself to the keeping of such a man's son, but this she felt would be somehow divinely rather than humanly accomplished; in reverting to the comfort of a more positive faith from her ancestral Unitarianism, she grew constantly in the grace of a belief in, at least, subjective miracles. That everything would come out right in the end, was so clearly a part of the universal justice, that she could not have final question of it. When she permitted herself to join in any of the rare and guarded approaches of Anther and her husband to the matter, it was to interpose herself between what the doctor might say and its effect upon the rector. She made herself the interpreter of Anther's acquiescence in the rector's reasoning, so that it should be more of the nature of a robust and positive support. If it would not have taken from Enderby the honor of being first to reach a right conclusion, she might have argued that Anther had himself intimated it to him—when she was less confident of it she sometimes conjectured this. But, for the most part, she was sure that Dr. Enderby had been inspired to it, and that the notion of patience, of waiting on the Supreme Will, of looking for what the older theology called a "leading," was the true ground to take. She was the more to be praised in this, because patience was not one of her innate virtues, and it was ordinarily her practice in life to anticipate the signs and tokens for which she was now willing to trust.

Something, in fact a great deal, she held, was to be hoped from Hawberk's return to health and work. There, she argued, was proof that the case had never really lapsed into forgetfulness with the Power that makes for righteousness. It was affecting, it was

enough to bring the tears—and she showed them in her eyes—to know, as she knew by her husband's report of Anther's confidences, how poor Hawberk was taking the cruel wrong that had been done him by that wretched creature. No one else, surely, ought to insist upon justice, if *he* preferred mercy; and, certainly, if Hawberk took such a large, humane view, her husband ought to feel himself fully confirmed in it. Such a man could be trusted with the decision of what ought to be done about Hope. If he was willing to let the matter go for the present, no one else need bother.

To this conclusion, in these terms, Mrs. Enderby came; and, without transgressing the bounds of confidence in her cordiality with Hawberk, she tried to throw into her manner an appreciation, an approbation, which should be a reward to him, even in its want of relevance. As nearly as she might with self-respect, she lay in wait for him in his goings and comings to and from the mills, and she sent the very latest of her autumn flowers home by him, now to his daughter, and now to his mother-in-law, so that the old lady might not feel neglected. After one of the gay confabulations which Hawberk was as willing to hold as herself, she told him that now she knew where Hope got her happiness, and he owned that, well, yes, that sort of thing seemed to run in the family. As to his infirmity and his recovery from it, she would have liked to question him about it; but no opening offered itself, though she felt that Mr. Hawberk would have been perfectly willing to talk if they had once begun.

He was the most enthusiastic and optimistic of convalescents, and Anther, who had always to count with some sort of weakness, physical or moral, in his patients, had not the worse weakness to deal with in Hawberk. It was weakness of body, not of spirit, that confronted the physician, who could caution, but must not alarm, his patient as to his limitations. Hawberk was more strenuous than Anther in pushing their advantages against the common enemy, when he had begun sensibly to realize them. Without instruction, he suspended the laudanum altogether for a week; and one morning, at the end of it, he fell in the street, and was carried home senseless. It was just when John Langbrith had summoned his forces to the point of putting the mills into the charge of Hawberk and his business assistant, preparatory to going round the world so quickly that he would not be missed before he got back. When they told him of what had happened to Hawberk he said, "Hell!" and took up his burden again.

Hawberk went back to the alternating bane and antidote, and was much sooner at his work than John Langbrith in his skepticism could have imagined; but Langbrith's faith in him was gone, in spite of all that Anther could say or do to restore it. Even when, as the winter wore along towards the spring, and he was made to believe that Hawberk's laudanum had been gradually reduced again to nothing, and he had the witness of Hawberk's enthusiastic

efficiency against his own doubts, he practised a sardonic self-denial with regard to the fact.

"You let it run along till winter," he said to Anther, "and, if he keeps up till then, it'll be time enough to talk to me about taking a vacation. But I guess I've got enough of putting an opium-eater in charge of the mills, for one while."

In early April, when the first of the blackbirds had come prospecting as far north as Saxmills, Hawberk was one day making a personal examination of the logs in the boom at the head-gates, for certain sticks which he wished to experiment with, in a new idea of pulp which he had got. He slipped and fell into the water, still icy-cold; but he easily climbed out, and hurried home, to laugh at the prophecies of his mother-in-law, who told him that he had taken his death, as soon as he came dripping into the house. For once in a long series of gloomy forecasts, she was right. Pneumonia set in and, twenty-four hours after it set in, death put his seal to the cure of opium-eating which Doctor Anther had effected in a typical case.

As long as she lived, the seeress could boast, not only that she knew Hawberk would die as soon as she laid eyes on him, but also that, if Doctor Anther could have attended him, Hawberk would not have died.

XXXIII.

In March, John Langbrith's misery had pushed him to the desperate step of writing to his nephew that, somehow, at any risk or cost, he must get away from work for a while. It was not a case of life or death, and neither he nor Anther had pretended that it was so; but it was a case of what a man could stand and care to live. He said this to his nephew; but he said also that he had merely reached the point where he did not care what became of the business. If James Langbrith cared, he had better come home and look after it; for, in a month from the time he wrote, John Langbrith was going to leave it. Like some men who have found a grim pleasure in suppressing their feelings, and who, upon a sudden occasion, find a yet grimmer pleasure in freeing them, he poured out on his nephew the disgust he had bottled up in his heart for James Langbrith's views and aims, and said that he had better learn to make paper than plays, for more people wanted it; there was more demand even for poor paper than for poor plays. He said something about James Langbrith's being old enough to leave off being a loafer, and to turn to and do something for a living.

The letter, rightly read, was a cry of physical pain; but there is no doubt that it was a vulgar and abusive cry, and it filled Langbrith with a fury which was not greater than his astonishment. In his whole life, his uncle had never spoken so many words to him on business, and had never offered him any criticism on what he was doing or proposing to do. He had felt a sardonic reserve in John Langbrith at their spare encounters, but so long as it

continued reserve he did not care for it. He had a general contempt for his uncle, as a sort of mechanical-minded insect who could fulfil its office without volition or imagination, and now this insect had venomously risen and stung him in the tenderest part of his vanity. But he resolved to be a gentleman in repelling the attack. He determined not to answer John Langbrith's letter till he had let his wrath cool; not to judge him till he had submitted the case to another. The other was, of course, Falk, who did not give the matter too great thought when Langbrith pushed the letter peremptorily between him and a sketch Falk was making, and required to know what he thought of it. Falk read it with the sort of amusement which the pain of such a man as Langbrith is apt to give those who know him, and even those who like him; but, though he smiled, he could not refuse his friend the justice of owning, "Pretty nasty letter!"

Langbrith briefly wrote back to his uncle that he was not prepared to leave Paris at the moment; but that, if John Langbrith wished to relinquish his charge of the mills, it would be entirely acceptable to have them left in the hands of his business lieutenant and of Mr. Hawberk, who, as the old and devoted friend of his father, would doubtless feel, as his father's brother seemed not to have felt, the importance and sacred character of the charge. He made no reply to John Langbrith's sarcasms, but suffered himself the expression of a high, impersonal regret that he should have always mistakenly inferred his uncle's character from his father's. He could not, however, be altogether sorry that he had credited John Langbrith with the noble nature and magnanimous ideals of Royal Langbrith. Brief as it was, the letter was as insolently foolish as it could well be, and John Langbrith, reading it on the way up to Hawberk's house, where he had been summoned by news of Hawberk's dangerous condition, pushed it into his pocket with a pleasure in not having been mistaken as to the writer which few men would have been able to feel.

He had been told that he had better go up, by the young doctor who was hopelessly looking after Hawberk in place of Dr. Anther, then in the second week of typhoid fever. Anther had fought against the fever to the last, and when he succumbed to it he was already delirious, so that it was not known whether his asking for Mrs. Langbrith was or was not from a mind fully master of itself. But it did not matter. She was already on her way to him, at the first rumor of his sickness; and she carried her home into his homeless house, and gave him the tireless devotion in which alone she was not weak. She took her two women with her and installed them in the place, which she stripped the Langbrith homestead to make a little less comfortless. She published, so far as her action went, the fact of their affection to the whole village world. To some of those who came to offer the help she almost passionately refused; she said that Dr. Anther and she were engaged, and

that they were to be married as soon as he was well again. In the sort of vehemence with which she declared this, she might well have wished to put her purpose beyond recall. Mrs. Enderby and Mrs. Garley would have helped her; there were few in the village who would not have been glad to offer help, if that of her nearest friends and his had been allowed. She was not stupidly and jealously set upon the sole charge of the sick man: it was she who had first thought of having a trained nurse from Boston, and had suggested it to the young doctor, who did not like to venture on it. She put herself second to the nurse, and subordinately shared her duties and vigils, claiming no rights and asserting no hopes they had not in common. She had not even the poor consolation of being the subject of the sick man's ravings. His crazy thoughts ran mostly upon Hawberk, whom he fancied advising and cautioning as to his case. Two or three times he dimly knew Mrs. Langbrith, but supposed himself in her own house with her. He sometimes mistook the nurse for her. All the tragedy that had allied them in the past, the baffle, the defeat, the despair was wiped out; and a trivial cheerfulness replaced it in the sick man's delirium.

John Langbrith came to tell her of Hawberk's death, and he said to the bewilderment in which she listened, "What are you going to do about James? He ought to come home, if he ever means to; but *I* can't make him."

"I will," she said from her daze, without asking him why he could not do it, as he, perhaps, intended. But she sat still without offering to put her will into any sort of effect.

"I've got the cablegram-blank with me," John Langbrith said. "You want to cable him, don't you?"

"Yes," she answered. "What shall I say?" she asked.

"Oh, anything, just 'Hawberk dead: come immediately.'"

She wrote mechanically from his dictation; then she put in a word.

"Well," John Langbrith said, with his grim smile, "it wa'n't necessary to have the 'Mister,' but it only costs twenty-five cents more, and he didn't get the 'Mister' so often while he was alive. Want to sign it, don't you?"

"Oh, yes," and she took the despatch from him. Then, after a hesitation she signed it "Mother" and gave it back, and let him go without asking anything about Hope.

John Langbrith staid two days for Hawberk's funeral; then, with some formality, referring to the favorable symptoms in Anther's case, which he would not have observed, perhaps, if they had been unfavorable, he broke away from his work, and took his misery with him on a vacation. He had a blind notion that a sea voyage would be the thing for him, and he thought of a trip to Bermuda. But he found that he could not get back under a week, and, desperate as he was, he could not bring himself to put that time be-

tween him and possible recall to his life cares. He devolved upon a trip to Old Point Comfort, and went and returned by the coastwise steamers, which encountered heavy weather enough to prolong both voyages, and to give him several days of haggard unrest at the beach hotel. He got in, he considered, a full week of sea-air by this means, and he arrived in New York one morning in time to take a Boston train which would connect for Saxmills, so that he could sleep at home that night.

He imagined it in this phrase before he realized, with a sardonic humor, that it would be going to bed, rather than sleeping, at home. He did not know how he was ever to sleep again anywhere; and the flame in his stomach fretted him to a white heat of exasperation with everything in life and the world. He was going back not better but worse, and he was going to take up alone the burden that Hawberk had divided with him during the last six months. Why need Hawberk have died now, damn him? He raged, and he cursed the fool for losing his life on that idiotic venture, when he could have sent any boy in the mills to pick out the right logs. In his thought, he visited the insufficiency of his business lieutenant with equal fury and profanity, and wondered what hell of a muddle he would have contrived to make of things in the week that he had been left alone. He included Anther in the rage of his condemnation, for being down with typhoid just when his skill was needed to save Hawberk, and he included that young jackass of an Emering, who knew as much about practising medicine as John Langbrith knew about sailing a ship. The figure was an effect from his recent voyages, in which all forms of navigation had fallen under his contempt, as incompetent to supply a man with the seasickness on which he had counted as one of the means of relief from his dyspepsia. While the boat rolled and pitched, and cries for help hailed the stewards from every stateroom, he had kept a steadfast stomach, such as it was; and he had maniacally calculated in his anguish that there was not enough water in the Atlantic Ocean to put out the fire that was burning in his hold.

It was still smoldering when the train stopped ten minutes for refreshment at New Haven, and Langbrith, who had started breakfastless from New York, recklessly decided to supply it with fresh fuel. As everything indifferently disagreed with him, he did not see why he should not have a cup of turbid coffee, a plate of cold beans and a piece of apple-pie, as well as anything wholesome, and he was wiping the traces of this repast from his shaggy moustache when he ran for his train, and scrambled into his parlor-car, just before the porter picked up his carpeted-step and swung himself aboard. As he crowded through the narrow aisle on his way to take his seat again, he glanced into the smoking-room and met the eye of his nephew, who turned at the same moment from watching the shipping in the harbor through the windows and over the platforms of the cars receding on the sidings.

They knew each other with less surprise on John Langbrith's part than James Langbrith's; but it was the uncle who expressed an ironical astonishment, when he decided to be first to break the silence in which they were glaring at each other. "Oh!" he said, "*thought* you'd come over!"

XXXIV.

Everything in the sight of the young man made the older man hate him; but, most of all, it was the indefinable touch of Europe, of France, of the Latin Quarter in James Langbrith's dress which, while it could not interpret itself explicitly to John Langbrith's ignorance, expressed something superiorly and offensively alien.

"Uncle John," the young man's misfortune was to intensify this effect by the tone of his suggestion, "don't you think we had better leave anything of this sort till after—till later?"

"No, I don't," John Langbrith sourly responded. And he came into the smoking-room, and sat down in a chair opposite the corner of the sofa where James had been looking out of the window.

They had the place to themselves. It was the train which used to be called the "ladies' train," because of its convenient hours and slower gait, suitable to the leisurely transit of the unbusiness sex; and James Langbrith, in entering the car, had noted that, but for one man, there were only women in it, and had taken possession of the smoking-room to think the more unmolestedly of things that had filled, it seemed almost to bursting, his mind for the last ten days. John Langbrith had made no such observation, but he saw that they were alone with an opportunity for quarrel, with which he luxuriously toyed before he fully grasped it.

"When did you come?" he asked, after looking vainly for a splinter to chew upon. He caught sight of the porter's whisk-broom over the wash-bowl, and supplied himself with a straw.

In the mean time, James had said, "We got in this morning; our boat was thirty-six hours late; it was two days before I could get away after the cable reached me. She was the first boat out."

The words were spare enough, but there was an exculpatory flavor in them that suited John Langbrith's ferocious mood, and when James added, "How is my mother, and Hope?" he loosed himself upon the young man.

"I don't know. I haven't seen them for a week, and I don't want to bandy any small talk with you. I got your answer to my letter all right, and I want to have a square understanding with you. I don't know as we ever had a regular understanding, did we?"

"I don't know that we did, if you mean about the mills."

"I mean about the mills. What the devil else could I mean?"

"That," said James, "was all arranged before I was old enough to have any understanding with you, and since then I have let my absolute trust in you take the place of an understanding."

"I know that damn well. But the time has come now when I don't want your absolute trust."

It occurred again to James Langbrith, as it had occurred before, since getting his uncle's astounding letter, that his uncle might be mad.

"I want to know whether you've come home for good, to take a grown man's share in your own business."

"That depends," James parried the issue. He was really no more afraid of the impending quarrel than his uncle, but he was a dreamer, and he liked to nurse his conclusions before trying them: liked to shy off from them and feign that they were not immediate, and perhaps not at all. John Langbrith was concrete where the young man was abstract, and his pleasure was to force the issue.

"It don't depend on me. I'm done with the thing. I'm going back to Saxmills, but it's to pull out for good and all."

"I suppose," James Langbrith assented, "that there will be an accounting and a settlement?"

"Oh, don't you be afraid of that, young man. There'll be a settlement all right, and after I've been paid a little more than day's wages, you can have the rest." John Langbrith felt the coffee and beans and pie beginning to ignite, and he flamed out upon his nephew from that inner conflagration, "What do you mean by 'an accounting,' you—you whippersnapper?"

James Langbrith made no answer, and his uncle pulled his chair closer, and put his face so near that the young man turned his own slightly aside, to get it out of the current of his uncle's dyspeptic breath.

"What do you mean? What do you mean?" John Langbrith insisted. "Do you suppose Royal Langbrith was a man to put anybody slippery into his business?"

"You know," James Langbrith disgustedly, but quietly, responded, "that I could not mean to impugn your honor." With the effect of being pushed to the wall and menaced there, he looked like his mother, who had so often been in that place, first through his father's duress and then through his own.

"Honor!" John Langbrith spat the word out of his mouth. "*I'm* talking *business!* What sort of man do you suppose your father was, anyway?"

A light, less of hate for his uncle than of love for his ideal of the father he had never known, kindled in James Langbrith's eyes, the long eyes of his mother. "He was, at least, a gentleman."

"That's to say I'm *not.* Well, go on. We'll take it for granted in my case. How do you know he was a gentleman, heigh?" He pressed him with the last word, and repeated it with a smile of scorn and pain. "Heigh? How do you know?" James Langbrith moved his head from side to side, as much now to escape what message of disaster might be coming as the effluvium that should bear it. But he made no answer, and John Langbrith hitched himself so near that his bony shins sawed against his nephew's legs, and he tapped him on the knee with his spiky forefinger, in the habit he had when

talking business with people. He was talking business now as he said: "You don't know? Well, I do, because he was my brother, and I knew him up to within twenty minutes of his death. If he didn't reform within them twenty minutes"—John Langbrith in his passion lost the grip, always uncertain, of his grammar—"he'd ought to have went smack, smooth, to hell, like shot out of a shovel!" James Langbrith's eyes dilated with the assured conviction of his uncle's insanity, but at the same time his nostrils swelled with resentment of the maniac's offence. John Langbrith gave him no chance for the expression of either the belief or the emotion. "Ever since I could remember him he was the coolest and slickest devil! I don't know where he got it! He had the trick of making other folks do his dirty work,—and he was full of that, I can tell you,—and keeping such a hold of 'em that they never had the chance to squirm out of the blame. He had *me* fixed good and fast, while we were boys, by a scrape he hauled me into along with him, and when he wanted me, any time, and said 'Come!' you bet I went. That's the way I came to be left in charge of his business when he died, and that poor fool of a Hawberk crowded out of it with lies that Royal threatened to tell his wife if he peeped. That's the way the woman Royal lived with down to Boston came to take what he give her and no questions asked, without makin' trouble for him, alive or dead. *She* was fixed so that *she* didn't peep! And so right along the whole line! If he hadn't cowed your mother for good and all she might have said something about the way he used to bully her; and when he came home from his Boston sprees used to pound her. Oh, he was a *gentleman,* Royal was! And that poor sheep of an Anther might have spoke out in meetin' if your mother hadn't been so mollycoddlin' about you, that she couldn't bear to have you told the truth, when he wanted to marry her, and couldn't make her tell. But *I'll* tell you now, and don't you forget it! Royal was such a gentleman that he cooked it up with the devil how to fool the whole town, and make 'em believe he was a saint upon earth. That library buildin'! He gave it out of the profits of the first year after he choused Hawberk, and the mis'ble crittur was makin' it all right for Royal by tryin' to kill himself with laudanum! Why, he made Royal Langbrith rich with his inventions, and then Royal got the credit of 'em; and he got the credit of doin' the handsome thing by a man that was an opium-fiend, according to his tell, from the beginning. And when you took it into your fool head to put up that tablet to him in the front of the library, he had things so solid that all hell couldn't bust 'em up. Anther did go round to Garley and tell him the rights of it, but that old chump honey-fugled him into believin' that he better let bygones be bygones, for fear of the corruptin' effects on the community. Then Anther come to me, the last thing, but I was stickin' to my job, just about then, and I thought if your mother wouldn't keep you from runnin' your neck into the noose, *I* wouldn't. I believe there wasn't a last one of them

jackasses up on the platform that wasn't as big a fool as you, except me and Anther and that old honey-fugler. And I ain't sure," John Langbrith said, withdrawing his furious face a little from its proximity to his nephew's, "but what I'd have held my tongue, now, if you hadn't put it to me that Royal Langbrith was a gentleman and I wasn't; but now you've got it, I guess, about as strong as they make it, right in the collar button!" He leaned forward again, and demanded in a fresh burst of fury, "I suppose you don't believe me? I presume you think I'm tryin' to work you, or off my nut, or just pure ugly! Well, you can ask Anther, when you get home. And you can ask your mother! And you can ask the mother of his other children—I'll give you her address. And you can ask that old honey-fugling fraud of a Garley! And you can ask Haw— Oh no, you can't ask him! He's out of it, but I guess his mother-in-law could tell you something she's suspected, all right! Oh, you've got a nice job cut out for you, young man! Why I wouldn't be in your shoes—"

The parlor-car conductor put his head in at the door, and looked at them. John Langbrith fell as suddenly silent as James Langbrith had been throughout. With the shadow of a changing mind passing over his face, the conductor said, "See: d' I get your tickets?" and James Langbrith, if not John Langbrith, knew that he had been drawn to them by the sound of a noisy, angry voice, and had meant to ask them to be quieter.

But the young man could not care. It would not have mattered to him now whether the whole world had overheard; the universal knowledge of the fact could be nothing, compared with the fact itself. His uncle got up and went out to his seat in the parlor, but James Langbrith did not move. He sat exposed to the tempest that had opened upon him without the shelter of a doubt. It seemed still to rage upon him like some war of the elements, and he was aware not only of the truth of what had been told him, but of its not being novel. He had that mystical sense of its having all happened before, long ago, and of a privity to it, in his inmost, dating back to his first consciousness. The awful conviction of the reality which held him like a demoniacal obsession was mixed with a physical loathing of his uncle's person, a disgust verging on sickness for his boiling hate, his vulgar profanities, mixed with the oldest and the newest slang, and the brute solecisms of the vernacular into which John Langbrith had lapsed in his passion. If he had wanted proof of what had been said of his father, the fact that John Langbrith was his father's brother would have been proof enough to the young man's shame.

From time to time, in the turmoil of his cognitions he had a nerveless impulse to follow his uncle, where he had gone to his seat in the drawing-room, and ask him this and that, but he did not. He was not aware of stirring till the porter came for his bag at the South Terminals in Boston. Then the horrible dream went on like

waking, as he drove across the city to the Northern Stations, and found his train for Saxmills. Till then he had lost sight of his uncle, but he saw him boarding the same train; he looked into the smoker, and finding it fairly full, he got into it, making sure that John Langbrith would not come to molest him there. He had no wish now but to keep away from him, to keep for the present out of the sight of the man who had heaped his dishonor upon him, and who alone of all that he could encounter, would be knowing to it.

Apparently John Langbrith had no wish to look him up. He had doubtless poured the last drop from the vials of his wrath out upon him, and was without any purpose of breaking them upon his devoted head. At any rate when they got out of the train at Saxmills, the uncle made no motion to approach his nephew. He stared at him, ignoring him as perfectly as if he were any other shadow of the vaguely lighted depot, and getting into one of the two ramshackle public carriages which had chanced a late passenger, drove off into the darkness. James Langbrith took the other, and bade the man, who was a stranger to him, drive to Mrs. Langbrith's.

All the way he had a sinking of the heart which was not related to the failure of his mother to have him met, after he had telegraphed her from New York that he was coming on that train. There was no lifting at sight of a belated lamp in the parlor, or at its moving thence, at his knock, and showing through the transom of the hall-door, which his mother opened to him herself.

(To be Continued.)

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXIII.

AUGUST, 1904.

THE BALTIC FLEET AND THE NORTHEAST PASSAGE.

BY REAR-ADMIRAL GEORGE WALLACE MELVILLE, U.S.N.

I HAVE been asked by the Editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to give my views as to the practicability of the use of the Northeast Passage through the Arctic Ocean by the Russian fleet in transit from the Baltic to the Pacific. In discussing this matter, I prefer to disregard the bearing which military expediency may have upon it, and to consider it solely from the standpoint of an Arctic explorer who, for almost two years, ice-beset in the "Jeannette," drifted to and fro over perhaps the most exposed and dangerous portion of this possible route. Russia's Baltic fleet, available for service in Asiatic waters, consists, according to recent reports, of from fifteen to twenty ships of large tonnage, the majority of which are battle-ships and armored cruisers. Broadly speaking, then, the question is simply whether heavy armored vessels of high power can face the northern ice successfully at this season and round Asia in safety.

The memorable achievement of Professor Nordenskjöld furnishes, in large part, an answer to this question. In the "Vega," a slow steam-whaler of but 300 tons burden, he left Tromsoe in July, 1878, and, late in September, put into Kuliuchin Bay, but little over a hundred miles from Bering Strait, where, blocked by

Copyright, 1904, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

closely packed ice, he was forced to winter. His somewhat late start, the slow speed and low power of his vessel, and an unfavorable season combined to prevent his immediate passage of the strait, since whalemen frequently traverse the seas near where he wintered for a month or more after his progress was stopped.

Before Nordenskjöld's day, however, a long line of Arctic navigators and explorers of many nations, with a daring equalled only by the toil and suffering they endured, had mapped, rudely, it is true, the shore-line from North Cape to Bering Strait, and, by their united efforts extending from the ninth century onward had practically completed, although in links parted by years and distance, the coast-survey of the Northeast Passage.

England, seeking maritime commerce, despatched, in 1553, the first important expedition under Sir Hugh Willoughby, one of whose captains, Richard Chancellor, reached a port which is now Archangel on the White Sea. In 1580, the Englishmen, Pet and Jackman, were the first sailors from the west to navigate the ice-blocked Kara Sea. Holland, looking for a way to the Indies which Spain and Portugal could not imperil, sent out in 1594, under the heroic Barents, the first of a number of expeditions fated, like those of England, to failure in their main purpose, but each adding its share to the world's knowledge of Arctic seas and shores. The English and Dutch efforts were supplemented and followed by those of the Russians, which, although begun for hunting purposes, were turned later toward exploration simply. By the middle of the seventeenth century, three-fourths or more of the entire northern shore had been traversed. Bering Strait was first passed in 1646, and Cape Chelyuskin, the Great North Cape of Asia, was discovered in 1742. For nearly twenty years previous to the latter date, an extended survey of much of the coast-line had been carried on by Russia.

In modern years, in addition to the "Vega's" cruise, Nordenskjöld made two preliminary exploring runs, one in a vessel of 70 tons, to the mouth of the Yenisei; Captain Joseph Wiggins has steamed successfully a number of times to the same destination; and the essays of commerce in the Arctic have been frequent from the West. With this knowledge and from my own experience in these seas, I do not hesitate to assert that, when there is need to face its possible dangers, the Northeast Passage must be regarded as a practicable route for a determined and able commander.

Turning to the map, let us glance at the probable course which a fleet would follow in this transit. After leaving the Baltic and rounding North Cape, the ships would proceed through Kara Strait, between Nova Zembla and the continent, to the north of White Island, and make directly for Cape Chelyuskin. Then, passing the cape and hugging the coast-line, the fleet should steer south of the New Siberia Islands and Wrangel Land to Cape Serdze-Kamen, East Cape, and Bering Strait. Thence, through the strait to Petropavlovsk in Kamchatka, where the ships could refit before further progress to the south.

The most practicable course is that near the coast-line, wherever possible. My reason for so thinking is that the prevailing winds frequently drive the ice off the coast, leaving a channel inshore. In the Kara Sea, the first obstruction from ice may be met; but the "Vega" found the strait free and the other voyages of Nordenskjöld and Wiggins extended to the Yenisei, eastward of these waters. Again, during July and August, whalemen go as far north as the Great Ice Cape of Nova Zembla, near which Barents wintered and off which he died.

A course between the New Siberia Islands and the coast is preferable, because the water is deeper there than it is between the islands of the group. In fact, there are no channels between these islands. Again, from June until October, there is nearly always open water south of the islands, since the ice is held off by the wind. The gap, nearly forty degrees of latitude in length, between the New Siberia Islands and Wrangel Land, is a stretch of sea in which the ice crowds down on the land; but there is deep water up to the shore, and, with each varying wind or tide, the ice may close in or leave within an hour or a day. Nordenskjöld was obliged to winter on the coast because the ice had pressed in near Cape Serdze-Kamen. It is altogether possible that a speedier ship of higher power than the "Vega" would have been able to push, not jam, her way through. Had he rounded this cape, he could have passed East Cape and proceeded through the open sea.

Until the Kara Strait is reached, no difficulties will be encountered which would not be met in ordinary cruising in high latitudes. The Arctic voyage practically begins at this point; and, in traversing the distance to East Cape, the dangers which might imperil the fleet are the persistent fog which prevails in the Arctic during the summer season, the illy charted waters through which

the ships must pass, and, finally, and most important of all, the ever-present ice.

Fogs and the lack of absolutely accurate charts will both necessitate low speed and the frequent use of the sounding-lead. It will be remembered, however, that our ignorance of this coast-line is relative only. The many efforts of many navigators of the past to which I have referred, have resulted in charts which give information, quite sufficient at least for times of stress, as to the depth of water, currents, and winds along the whole shore to East Cape. In this, I speak with extended knowledge, shadowed by some mournful memories, for I was the cartographer of the lost "Jeannette"; and, for many weary months, my companions and I studied eagerly the characteristics of that coast-line in our search for a safe line of retreat when, as we foresaw, our ship, ice-beset and leaking, must some day sink.

A further fact which will tend to reduce the possible danger of grounding is that the bottom of practically the whole of the Arctic basin north of Siberia is of sand or silt, owing to the discharge from the large rivers with many mouths which find outlet there. Hence, a rocky and irregular bottom is seldom met, although sand-banks and shoals are numerous. If the ships should take the ground at low speed, they must, therefore, in all probability, back off easily, with assistance from their consorts if necessary. These facts and the smooth sea which they would meet during the Arctic journey bring the likelihood of grounding within wholly practicable limits.

The question of the ice-obstruction is, in my view, the only possible danger of much importance. I have already noted the regions in which it is most likely to be met and the chances of freedom even there. It should be remembered also that a large, high-powered armored ship, having weight, momentum, and speed when required, will push her way with ease through the "pack" or broken ice which might bar wholly the progress of such a relatively small and weak craft as the "Vega" was. The pack will not trouble armorclads or the protected-cruisers and colliers which accompany them. The real ice-peril lies in meeting the solid "floe," which, driven by the wind, might force the ship bodily on a shoal or ashore. The meeting is quite possible, but I have already pointed out the favoring circumstances in the character of the bottom, the nature of the prevailing winds, and the occa-

sional shelter of the islands. Under average circumstances, the rest may well be left, and safely, to the seamanship of able and determined men. There is the additional possibility of being caught between two colliding floes, but this is not probable and can be avoided by skilful and careful ice-navigation. While I have raised the ghosts of these possible perils, I do not believe that they are substantial probabilities. Did not Nordenskjöld, in his small, slow craft, traverse the Northeast Passage in entire safety? He was accompanied also, for much of the distance, by the "Lena," a mere iron-tank steamer, which passed on unscathed, and, if not since lost, is still running, in the summer time, on the Lena River carrying freight and passengers. Again, on the Greely Relief Expedition, commanded by Captain (now Rear-Admiral) Schley, of which I was a member, we took with us as a collier a common iron tramp-steamer, the "Loch Garry," which, without stiffening timbers or outside protection, forced her way through the ice-blocked seas unhurt, as far north as Upernavik. As a whole, the ice-question, while problematical, has much to minimize its dangers.

The ships of a war-fleet, such as is under discussion, are armored to four feet or more below the water-line, stiffened from end to end by the protective deck, and have massive bows fitted for attack by ramming. They are, therefore, far more capable than the ordinary merchant steamer of pushing a way through the pack and of resisting the side-pressure of opposing floes. Again, such vessels as have the extended ram-bow of French type are equipped with the best possible weapon for attack on the ice, by underrunning it and allowing it to break of its own weight. As an additional precaution, the bows of all ships should be strengthened with heavy timbers; the latter, laid athwartships, should be used to stiffen the hull, and there should be a removable iron-plated timber-sheathing, extending, at the water-line, from the bows to amidships. This sheathing and the timbers could be removed to St. Lawrence Bay below East Cape, before going south to Petropavlovsk. These precautions must be regarded as extraordinary, if the passage be made in the open summer season. In addition to the other instances which I have cited of ordinary vessels cruising at this time in these waters in safety, I recall that Mr. Oscar Dickson and other northern merchants started an experimental line of steamers to carry grain from the mouth of the

Yenisei River to Europe. The enterprise failed, not because of the destruction of the ships but because it was not a commercial success. There is every probability, therefore, that men-of-war could find their way with ease through the loose ice-pack, and, if heavy floes are met, with their strong hulls and powerful machinery they should be able to push from their path floes which would stop a weaker vessel.

Coal could not be obtained at any point along the Northeast Passage, unless, as is very improbable, it could be sent on flat boats down the Yenisei or Obi rivers. On the other hand, all of the ships of the Baltic fleet have, or should have, fuel in their bunkers sufficient for a steaming radius of 5,000 miles, especially as, for reasons given previously, the speed must be low. Sufficient for an additional 1,000 miles can also be carried on their decks and in their fire-rooms, since the ships will not become topheavy as there are no rolling seas on this coast, calm water prevailing until the Great East Cape is rounded, by which time the ships would be lightened and ready to proceed in the open sea. During the Arctic voyage, therefore, such deck-loads would have no injurious effect upon the stability; they would simply increase the draught.

To provide for all emergencies with regard to fuel, a squadron of colliers should accompany the fleet, these tenders being sufficient in number to allow for the possible destruction of a fair percentage of these relatively weak vessels by the ice-floes. The colliers should discharge their cargoes at different points along the route. The first division of these tenders, for example, could transfer their coal to the fleet at the Kara Strait and then return to Kronstadt; the second could unload at Cape Chelyuskin, proceed to the White Sea, refit, and steam westward to a home port; a third could discharge at the Great East Cape and then make Unalaska or St. Michaels in Norton Sound; and the remaining colliers with full loads could accompany the fleet to Petropavlovsk.

These tenders, not being constructed for ice-navigation, should be strengthened, as has been described previously. They should have wooden sheathing on the bows and along the sides to amidships for four feet down from the water-line, and transverse stiffening timbers should be fitted in the bunkers. As I have stated, this is an unusual, and in a favorable season it would be an unnecessary, precaution. Our collier in the Greely Relief Ex-

pedition did not require it, and the experience of the "Lena" and the "Frazier," which accompanied Nordenskjöld through a portion of his journey, was similar.

It has been suggested, in discussions of the possible transit of the Arctic by the Russian fleet, that the ice-breaker "Ermack" should be able to force a passage for the war-ships. I doubt the practicability of this, since her coal-capacity is probably small. Of course, no vessel yet constructed by man will cut a channel through heavy floe ice. In lesser work, however, the "Ermack," if she could carry coal enough for a run of reasonable length, might be of much assistance to the expedition.*

I have gone over briefly the main facts bearing on the possible transit of the Northeast Passage by a fleet of war-ships. In this discussion, I have not viewed the question either from a military or an academic standpoint, but from that of the long and somewhat bitter experience which I met in actual service in the Arctic, especially in waters which such a fleet would traverse. From my knowledge of those seas, I firmly believe in the practicability of such a voyage, under the conditions I have recited. As to the military advisability or necessity of such an effort, I say nothing. The early failures to complete the Northeast Passage were but the attempts of heavy, slow, and ill-equipped sailing vessels. There seems now no doubt of the transit in the summer season by strong, high-powered steamships and men-of-war. In facing its possible dangers, a determined commander would find inspiration not only in the national need of his service, but in the memory of the fidelity and fortitude of men like Willoughby, Chancellor, Barents, Bering, Nordenskjöld, and a long line of explorers, whose names shine brilliantly on every page of the history of the Northeast Passage.

GEORGE WALLACE MELVILLE.

* The "Ermack" is 335 feet long, 71 feet beam, and, with coal and stores on board, is about 8,000 tons displacement.

AUTOMOBILE LEGISLATION: A CRITICISM AND REVIEW.

BY THE HONORABLE JOHN SCOTT-MONTAGU, M.P.

THE chief characteristic in the history of automobile legislation is the continual, misdirected effort of the law to control vehicles about which the law-makers have had, as a rule, but shadowy and erroneous ideas. The general public have hardly known what they really wanted, except protection against dangerous driving; whilst motorists, on the other hand, desiring reasonable freedom, have been led to fight against restrictions which have impeded, and in some cases are still impeding, the development of the automobile. In my opinion, the fatal fault underlying the legislation of most countries is found in the designation of a specific speed limit as a means of insuring safety to other road-users. "Speed" and "danger" are not equivalent terms, any more than "slowness" and "safety"; and the use of discretion by the driver is a better guarantee of safety to the public than the mere limitation of miles per hour. However, it must be admitted that, in certain places where crowded traffic and narrow streets exist, a speed limit is harmless; but it is also useless for public protection, for slow vehicles in crowded streets kill persons as well as faster carriages. A speed limit on the open highroad will always be a source of friction between the motorist and the authorities, and this system of attempting to control automobile traffic suffers from the two fundamental disadvantages of being, as a rule, unenforceable, on the one hand, and, on the other, useless, so far as public safety is concerned. Future generations in all civilized countries will laugh at the cumbrous and illogical efforts their forefathers made to restrict the use of the automobile, and smile at their assumption that it was a dangerous and uncontrollable vehicle. Before another decade shall have passed, it

is not unlikely that the horse vehicle will be regarded as uncontrollable rather than the motor-car. Indeed, this is sufficiently demonstrated by statistics to-day, for the number of people killed and injured in the bigger cities of Europe and America by horse-drawn vehicles is unexpectedly large, while the number of motor-car accidents per mile run is small in proportion.

Automobilists are also harassed by legislation inspired, to some extent, by horse-breeders and horse-dealers, who are now beginning to fear the progress of a new and dangerous rival. There is, therefore, a constant effort to limit motor-cars to the same speed as their own animals can attain, for fear their trade should be injured. It should also be remembered that there are many millions of capital invested to-day in horse traction which will gradually become unremunerative, for it is certain that the automobile will largely alter the course of some trades and ruin them, unless they change their methods and begin to adapt their businesses to the conditions created by the new vehicle.

The stages through which the law has passed regarding automobilism has been much the same in every country, and the changes have faithfully represented public opinion. First of all, there has been the stage of contemptuous indifference or disbelief, legislatures having at one time held that it was quite unnecessary to legislate for vehicles which were never likely to become numerous or practical. This stage has been generally followed by fear and by inability to understand the immensely greater power of control in mechanical than in animal traction; and that again has been followed by jealous dislike of and prejudice against a system of propulsion which is contrary to the ideas of all previous generations. The third stage has been often marked by panic legislation, due to the fact that the increase of motor-cars has been so rapid in some countries that a new political and social force has arisen, which is feared by those who love to cling to old ideas. When, also, the establishment of the motor-car becomes assured in any country, it naturally arouses jealousy in the minds of the majority of others engaged in traction work. Some people at once endeavor to see how the new method can be made useful to themselves, while others offer senseless and pig-headed opposition. Railway companies are a good instance of this. They first of all disregarded and despised the automobile; then they grew afraid of it; and now the more enter-

prising companies are using it largely in connection with their systems. The parliaments of all nations have also displayed a marked tendency to legislate for motorists without realizing that they are, after all, in the main humane and sane men. It seems to be difficult to persuade some legislators that motorists value their lives like other people, and that they do not habitually desire to kill or wound their fellow men; also, that the possession of a valuable machine naturally tends to make the owner cautious as to what he does with it.

In the several countries the national temperament is at once apparent in its effect upon the legislation. In France, a country naturally receptive of new ideas, automobile legislation has been, on the whole, much more liberal than in other countries. Not only this, but the administrators of the law have been judicial and unprejudiced. In England, the reverse has been the case. The first automobile law of 1896 was justifiably cautious; for, at that time, it was thought to be almost indecent to ask for a speed of more than twelve miles an hour, the pace attained at times by a fast trotting-horse, the highest standard of road travelling then available. In Great Britain the feeling in some localities is still against the motorist, though it is not so prevalent or so violent as it was a year or two ago.

In Germany, the official and bureaucratic tendency has manifested itself in the number of regulations filled with minute instructions about everything which a driver should or should not do, and the limitation of speed in cities, in some cases, to less than four miles an hour. A total prohibition is also in force in some of the provincial towns, in order, to use the German official words, "not to frighten children and horses."

In the United States, the lack in most places of good roads, except in the immediate vicinity of the large cities, has of course hitherto been a drawback to widespread automobilism. In the backwoods and out-of-the-way districts, where the inhabitants live at a great distance from the railway and larger towns, the harmless automobile has been looked upon as a creation of the Evil One; and the horse-breeding and farming interests, not seeing in the automobile their best friend, have started agitations with the result that some quite unnecessary and disagreeable restrictions have been passed into law.

But in all cases we must assume that the object of reasonable

automobile legislation is to make drivers cautious and to protect the public. In order that the reckless driver may be punished, identification, in almost all countries, has been resorted to, and the penalties for the infringement of the laws as to speed or dangerous driving generally take the form of fines, and in some cases imprisonment as well. Both these penalties are, as a rule, reinforced by forfeiture of license in cases of grave misconduct for a more or less extended period. It may be that the best solution of the difficulties which must be met by the framer of any comprehensive motor-car legislation in future may be found in adopting the precedent of the laws applying to sea-going vessels. The principle underlying marine legislation is that the onus of avoiding collision or danger lies upon the faster and the more easily controlled vessel, on the assumption that it is her duty to keep out of the way of the slower and less handy craft. It is, therefore, a fixed rule, commonly obeyed, that the fast liner has to give way to the sailing brig or even to the pleasure yacht, provided that the liner herself is not forced into a dangerous position, and that reasonable common sense and caution are used on both sides.

With regard to the historical aspect of legislation, I give below the chief points of interest.

Great Britain. In the early part of the last century, about 1824-1835, steam-carriages were running on the high-roads with a good deal of success, and were eventually considered to be dangerous competitors to the stage-coaches of those days. The stage-coach and horse-owning fraternity, therefore, set to work, with the cooperation of the horse-breeding interest, *i. e.*, the farmer, and eventually achieved success by persistent and unfair obstruction of the roadways, until the crowning piece of legislative restriction came in 1865, which provided that every road locomotive should be preceded by a man with a red flag, and should not exceed a pace of four miles an hour in the country, and two miles an hour in towns. This state of things existed until 1896.

The Light Locomotives on Highways Act abolished the man with the red flag; and, terming motor-cars "light locomotives"—a somewhat cumbersome definition—allowed them to proceed at a speed not exceeding fourteen miles an hour, the maximum fixed by Parliament, which the Local Government Board further reduced to twelve miles an hour.

In 1903, there having been much public agitation on both sides for three or four years—motorists, on the one hand, pleading that the speed limit was ridiculous, and bitterly complaining of the injustice of police traps and the fallacious cheap stop-watch system; the public, on the other hand, complaining that it was impossible to identify motor vehicles which had caused accidents or annoyance, and clamoring for numbers or some easily visible marks of identification—the Motor-Car Act was passed which is the chief law to-day. The writer of this article took a prominent part in the debates, and was at the time much blamed by some unthinking persons for being unable to defeat the large anti-motorist majority which then existed in the House of Commons. Although by no means a perfect Act, from a motorist's point of view, it is now admitted to be a great improvement on the Act of 1896. The measure provides for identification by numbers, and allows a maximum speed of twenty miles an hour, a figure which represents the compromise arrived at by the Government between those supporting the speed limit of twelve miles and those who opposed any limit at all. Parliament by a large majority thought it desirable to fix a speed limit, and the automobile party were powerless, except to resist as much as possible a further reduction below twenty. Looking back upon the fight of last August, I certainly think we were lucky to come out as well as we did.

Great Britain and Ireland are divided into 243 districts, for the purposes of registration, under the authority of the county councils and county boroughs. Thus, cars registered in London bear the letter "A" with the owner's name, those in Hertfordshire "B." The letters "I" and "S" are similarly placed before the county or borough letter on cars registered in Ireland and Scotland, respectively. Drivers must also obtain a license, which is in no way a guarantee of ability to drive, but solely a means to enable the law to cancel the right to drive in cases which call for this penalty under the Act. The charge for a motor-car license is one pound, for a motor-cycle five shillings, and a driver's certificate costs five shillings. The Act has, however, to be reconsidered in three years from its enactment, *i. e.*, in 1906; and British automobilists, while not objecting to some portions of the Act, hope that any speed limit on open country roads will be removed, and that the Legislature will recognize that the section dealing with reckless driving embodies in a comprehensive way

everything necessary for the public safety, and that this section alone should be accepted as an ample safeguard. In my opinion, a general power such as this is far more efficient than any specifically defined speed limit.

France. There have never been in France any restrictions to be compared with those of the red-flag law which existed in Great Britain prior to November, 1896. In 1894, motor-cars had already begun to appear to some extent on the roads of France, but it was not till the decree of May, 1899, which contained the nucleus of the law that now governs the use of automobiles in the French Republic, that any attempt was made to deal seriously with the question of speed, registration or identification.

The first section of this decree mostly deals with the design of the car, and provides that the construction shall be such as to prevent any escape of explosive material or fuel which would cause fire.

Sub-sections 2 and 3 provide for the registration of owners, and for permission to circulate in the country. The regulations of France differ from those of Great Britain, in that the certificate denotes competency to drive and is given to an applicant only after a trial. This trial takes the form of an examination by an official of the Mining Department; but the trial is not of much practical use, merely consisting of going backwards and forwards, using the brake, and driving through ordinary traffic. Still, there is no doubt that, to a certain extent, it prevents entirely unskilled drivers from being a source of danger to themselves and the rest of the public, though it cannot prevent recklessness or selfishness.

Sub-section 4 of Section III. describes the regulations as to one vehicle towing another, to which form of vehicle the name of "trailer" has been given in England and America.

Sub-section 6 deals with the driving in traffic of commercial vehicles upon which there are heavy loads, or after which are drawn trailers conveying loads.

Sub-section 7 deals with the question of speed, and the following quotation may be interesting to readers:

"Automobile races may not take place on the public roads without a special permit delivered by each of the Prefects of the Departments interested, after reports from the chief of the highway services. This permit will not relieve the organizers of the race from the obligation

of obtaining permission from each commune interested at least eight days before the date fixed for the race. The speed may then exceed eighteen miles an hour (thirty kilos) in the open country, but in any case may not exceed twelve miles an hour in congested districts."

This is the sub-section under which the races are held in France, and thus the wishes of the inhabitants of various localities have to be consulted beforehand; but as the races invariably bring a good deal of money into the said districts, it is rarely that much objection is offered. After two penalties or convictions in a year the authorities have power to endorse the driving certificate, this power being analagous to that prevailing under the Motor-Car Act of 1903 in Great Britain. Some modifications have lately taken place in this decree, providing that all motor-cars weighing over six cwt. shall have a reversing gear fitted. Identification by numbers is also insisted upon for all mechanical vehicles, whether commercial or private.

With reference to the administration of the French automobile laws, it may be said they are usually leniently administered, and the police as a rule exercise great common sense in the application of the regulations. It is rarely that a touring-car is interfered with, unless reckless driving is indulged in, through or near towns. In the open country, police traps are never set; and it is small wonder, therefore, that people are beginning to tour in France in increasing numbers every year, in consequence of the liberal treatment they obtain from the French public and authorities. Local French hotels are thus decided gainers in this respect over such institutions in the country districts of Great Britain.

Germany. In Germany, as might be expected, the rules and regulations are numerous, and deal with every manner of detail. No uniform law or regulations have, however, been passed by the Reichstag for the whole community, but each state has made its own decrees, and the decrees differ widely in different parts of the Empire.

The police regulations for Berlin, however, have been adopted by most of the principal German states and cities. It is expected that before long the Government will bring forward a bill dealing with motor-cars on the lines of these regulations.

The chief points insisted upon in Berlin are that, with regard to speed, motor-cars after dusk, on streets or roads bordered with

houses or shops, must not exceed the speed of a good trotting-horse (a curious and indefinite method of computation), in practice estimated at about nine miles an hour. This speed, however, may be increased according to the judgment of the driver on open and straight roads, he, however, being held responsible and liable in case of any accident. With regard to the cars themselves, it is ordered that each motor-car must be provided with two separate and quick-acting brakes, each of which must be capable of bringing the vehicle to a stop on smooth and dry asphalt, when going at a speed of nine miles an hour, within a distance of twenty-five feet. Each motor-car has also to carry identification marks, consisting of a letter of the alphabet with a number, the details of which are regulated by the police. Driving certificates are issued by the authorities, and all drivers must comply with the regulations printed thereon. In Berlin, the certificate is first issued by some school of instruction recognized by the authorities, or given by a recognized expert. Foreigners coming into Germany, and holding certificates from their own country, must have these certificates examined and passed by the German authorities before permission is given to drive at all in the country. The penalties inflicted for breach of any of the regulations are money fines up to five pounds and imprisonment up to fourteen days. These regulations, which apply to Berlin, are also in force, as I have before stated, in many of the smaller German states—for instance, they are the law in the provinces of East and West Prussia, Hanover, Brandenburg, Hesse-Nassau, Posen, Silesia, Schleswig-Holstein, and Westphalia. In the Duchy of Brunswick, the speed limit in cities has been fixed at six miles an hour, in the open country outside towns at eighteen miles an hour. In the province of Würtemberg, the same speed on the open road is allowed, but the speed within town areas is slightly higher. In Alsace-Lorraine, the regulations affecting automobiles are exceedingly severe. In the city of Colmar, for instance, a motor-car may not exceed the speed of a horse-driven vehicle which may happen to be only going at four miles an hour. Some nineteen streets are altogether forbidden to motor-cars in Metz, while in the remaining roads and streets only a speed of eight kilometres, or five miles, an hour is permissible.

Switzerland. This country is not suitable for fast automobile travelling, on account of the severe gradients to be encountered,

and the fact that many of the roads have a rock wall on one side and a precipice on the other. The various cantons have also combined to make their localities as unpopular as possible to automobilists. Each canton has its own code of rules and laws, all of them very stringent and restrictive. In several cantons—for instance in Grisons and Valais—motor vehicles are prohibited altogether. The hotel-keepers in many parts are beginning to complain bitterly, but the fly-driving proprietors and their adherents are powerful enough to prevent any change at present, assisted as they are by the ignorance of many of the population.

United States. In the United States, each State has its own regulations, though here they do not differ so materially one from the other as in other countries. The speed limit was fixed last year, and provides for a maximum of twenty miles an hour on open roads, but makes the automobilist liable for any accident occurring when passing another vehicle or domestic animal. This clause, which has been named the "pig and chicken" clause by the Automobilists of America, has given rise to much controversy. In some towns there is great feeling against the motor-car being allowed to use the roads at all, but public opinion in the United States is gradually becoming more enlightened and less prejudiced on this point. The popular movement in favor of better roads is also a sure sign that the motor-car is making headway. It seems, moreover, that the Western States are becoming more lenient in their penalties and more liberal in the matter of speed allowance than those in the East; this, however, may be due to the fact that, except on the main roads of the Western States, it is almost impossible to drive a motor-car, so bad is their condition, and the nature of the roads prevents, therefore, any excessive pace.

Belgium. The Belgians were not far behind their Continental neighbor, France, in originally recognizing the utility of the automobile; and, though only a comparatively small country, the value of motor-cars exported to Great Britain in 1903 was £147,286, against £68,180 in the previous year. This gives evidence that the Belgian people are fully alive to the advantages of mechanical traction. A Royal Decree, dated August, 1899, forms the basis of the regulations now in force, though within the last few months a movement has been on foot to obtain fuller and more concise legislation for automobilists; and, as the number of motor vehicles daily increases, it is probable that considerabl

alterations will be made before long. The Royal Decree above referred to provides that every motor vehicle shall carry, on the left side and also on the front of the car, a plate bearing the name and address of the owner. In addition, each vehicle must carry before and behind a plaque bearing a number, and these plaques are obtainable from the various administrations over the country. The decree allows a speed of 18½ miles an hour on roads outside towns and villages, and fixes the speed for Brussels and large towns at six miles an hour—a regulation which, however, is habitually disregarded in practice. In the town of Antwerp, the authorities will not permit a speed greater than that of a horse-driven vehicle—the usual indefinite clause. Various regulations deal with lights, signals, brakes, wheels, etc., much on the model of the French system. Though in some towns very restrictive measures are prevalent, as in the case of Antwerp, the Belgian *gendarme* and authorities are, as a rule, very fair-minded and anxious to see that no injustice is done; in fact, a liberal interpretation is usually made in favor of the motorist.

Austria. The regulations affecting automobiles in the principal cities of Austria are stringent, and it is proposed by the Municipal Council of Vienna that even further restrictions than those existing at present should be imposed. The cars have to undergo a severe official inspection, and identification numbers larger than those enforced under the law in England and France have to be carried. The maximum speed limit is very low, 7½ miles being fixed. Austria is also, so far as I can ascertain, the only country which has passed a regulation forbidding women to drive a motor-car at all.

Italy. The laws of Italy in connection with motor-cars are not stringent, and are framed on those of France.

It is not improbable that, within a few years, fresh attempts will be made to curtail the use of motor-cars, or to render their use more difficult. If it is desired, however, to prevent motor-cars being dangerously used, it is to be hoped that all Governments will clearly recognize that speed limits are of no use for the purpose of preventing accidents. The best way will be to make the law elastic enough to meet every circumstance. The advent, however, of the new era in traction cannot be stopped, though it may be delayed by senseless and short-sighted legislation.

JOHN SCOTT-MONTAGU.

THE PRESENT CRISIS IN TRADES-UNION MORALS.

BY JANE ADDAMS.

In spite of the fact that sympathy for trades-unions never rose so high in America as during the long anthracite-coal strike, the past two years afford undoubted evidence of a reaction against the cause of organized labor. This evidence may be cited in the increasing number of Employers' Associations, some of which, in spite of carefully worded constitutions, are making direct war not only upon the practices of trades-unions, but upon their very existence; in the acute exasperation exhibited by many manufacturers who were previously, at least, in a state of friendly neutrality; in the oft-repeated assertion that it is impossible to extend business operations in the present state of the labor market; in the recognition of the non-union man as the "modern hero," and of his sufferings as those of the martyr; in the practice of the newspapers to state at great length the acts of trades-union lawlessness, and to make but terse reports of their renewal of contracts and other legitimate actions; and in that which is, perhaps, the most significant, the increasing confusion of mind on the part of the public, which tends to make trades-unions directly responsible for many of the difficulties inherent in the factory system itself.

It is always difficult to judge a contemporaneous movement with any degree of fairness, and it is perennially perplexing to distinguish what is merely adventitious and temporary from that which represents essential and permanent tendencies. This discrimination is made tenfold more difficult when a movement exhibits various stages of development simultaneously, when several historic phases are going on at the same time; and yet every historic movement towards Democracy, which constantly gathers

to itself large bodies of raw recruits while the older groups are moving on, presents this peculiar phenomenon. In the case of trades-unions, certain groups are marked by lawlessness and disorder, others by most decorous business methods, and still others are fairly decadent in their desire for monopolistic control. It is a long cry from the Chartists of 1839, burning hayricks, to John Burns of 1902, pleading in the House of Commons with well-reasoned eloquence for an extension of the workingmen's franchise; and yet they are both manifestations of the same movement towards universal suffrage, and show no greater difference than that between the Chicago teamsters, who were blocking commerce and almost barricading the streets, and John Mitchell, who at the same moment made his well-considered statement that he would rather lose the coal strike, with all that that loss implied, than gain it at the cost of violence. Students of industrial history will point out the sequence and development of the political movement from the Chartist to the Independent Labor party; and yet they give no help to our bewildered minds when we would fain discover some order and sequence between the widely separated events of the contemporaneous labor movement.

We must first get down to the question, In what does "the inevitably destined rise of the men of labor" consist? What are we trying to solve in this "most hazardous problem of the age"? Is progress in the Labor Movement to come, as we are told progress comes in the non-moral world, by the blind, brute struggle of individual interests; or is it to come, as its earlier leaders believed, through the operation of the human will? Is it a moral phenomenon which must depend upon educators and apostles; or is it merely a conflict of opposing rights which may legitimately use coercion? The question, from the very nature of the case, is confusing; for, of necessity, the Labor Movement has perfectly legitimate economic and business aspects, which loom large and easily overshadow the ethical. We would all agree that only when men have education, a margin of leisure and a decent home, can they find room to develop the moral life: before that, there are too many chances that it will be crushed out by ignorance, by blinding weariness, and by indecency. But the danger lies in the conviction that these advantages are to be secured by any means, moral or non-moral, and in holding them paramount to the inner life which they are supposed to nourish. The Labor Movement

is confronted by that inevitable problem which confronts every movement and every individual. How far shall the compromise be made between the inner concept and the outer act? How may we concede what it is necessary to concede, without conceding all?

In considering this question we must remember the spiritual growth of one social group is conditioned by the reaction of other social groups upon it, and that the worship of success, so long dominant in America, has taught the majority of our citizens to count only accomplished facts and to make little inquiry concerning methods. This has long been done in regard to business enterprises and political parties, but it is evident that we intend to call a halt before we are willing to permit the same latitude to labor organizations.

The present moment is one of unusual crisis in that many of the trades-unions of America have reached a transitional period, when they can no longer be mere propagandists, but are called upon to deal with concrete and difficult situations. When they were small and persecuted, they held to the faith and its implications of idealism; as they become larger and more powerful, they make terms with the life about them, and compromise as best they may with actual conditions.

This transition is especially difficult just now; for, during this last period of prosperity, trades-unions have increased enormously in numbers; the State Federation of Minnesota, for instance, reports an increase of six hundred per cent. in one year. The well-established unions have also been flooded by new members who are not yet assimilated and disciplined, and they have further been beset and carried off their feet by that unrest which impels us all to hasten if we would avail ourselves of the advantages which prosperity affords. "If we don't get things now, when they are going, we won't get them at all," is often said by workingmen, and the expression voices that sense of unseemly haste which characterizes the entire community.

During this period of extraordinary growth, the labor movement has naturally attracted to itself hundreds of organizations which are yet in their infancy, and exhibit all the weakness of "group morality." This doubtless tends to a conception of moral life which is as primitive as that which controlled the beginnings of patriotism, when the members of the newly conscious nation considered all those who were outside as possible oppressors and

enemies, and were loyal only towards those whom their imagination regarded as belonging to the national life. They gave much, and demanded much, in the name of blood brothers, but were merciless to the rest of the world. In addition to its belligerent youth and its primitive morality, the newer union is composed of members who have long suffered what they consider to be grievances, and the accumulated sense of unredressed wrong makes them eager for a chance to "fight for their rights." At the same time, the employer always makes his most vigorous attack upon a new union, both because he does not wish organized labor to obtain a foothold in his factory, and because his chances for success are greatest before his employees are well disciplined in unionism, although in actual conflict a young union will often make a more reckless fight than an older one. The members of a newly organized group naturally respond first to a sense of loyalty to each other as against their employers, and then to the wider consciousness of organized labor as against capital. This stage of trades-unionism is full of war phraseology, with its "pickets" and "battle-grounds," and is responsible for the most serious mistakes of the movement. The sense of group loyalty holds trades-unionists longer than the normal period of development, doubtless because of the constant accretions of those who are newly conscious of its claims. It is strong enough to overcome astonishing difference of race and tradition, but becomes a veritable stumbling-block.

Those Chicago strikes which during the last few years have been most notably characterized by disorder and the necessity for police interference, have almost universally been inaugurated by the newly organized unions. They have called to their aid the older organizations, and the latter have entered into the struggle often under protest and obviously against their best interests.

The Chicago Federation of Labor has often given its official endorsement to hot-headed strikes on the part of "baby unions," because the delegates from the newly organized or freshly recruited unions had the larger vote, and the appeal to their loyalty and fraternity carried the meeting against the judgment of the delegates from the older unions.

It is only quite recently that the first attempts have been made in Chicago towards controlling this natural tendency of group morality in the interests of a larger conception of citizenship.

We may instance the successful efforts of the Packing Trades' Council against the practices of the Teamsters' Union, the charges being made and the investigations carried on through the Central Labor body. Later, the more law-abiding members of the Wagon-Makers' Union disciplined certain other members of the same union for their lawless acts, not only by the methods provided in their constitution for such discipline, but in the courts, where a conviction was secured. However, such action proceeds slowly, and in the mean time the unions are constantly disgraced by acts of disorder and lawlessness.

In their efforts to meet the requirements of business dealing, the older unions are not only hampered by the actions of the younger, but are handicapped by their own early enthusiasms.

On its idealistic side, trades-unionism is an international movement, founded upon one of those appeals to universal sentiment which bind men together because they are strong enough to overcome even national differences, and it has been this aspect which the business man has found it hardest to deal with, and which has most sorely tried his patience. He has said many times to the trades-unionists: "If you expect recognition from business men, you must be businesslike on your side. You must make a definite contract and stick to it. Supply us with skilled labor at a definite price, as a contractor supplies us with specified material at a definite price, and we will know where to find you, and try to deal with you. But if, because a man in Buffalo or Seattle has trouble with his working people, you are going to get up a sympathetic strike; if, because some non-union-made material comes into my factory, all of the union men are going to walk out, you cannot expect any sensible business man to try to get on with you." Such things were said only after unions had become large and powerful enough to be negotiated with; they were sensible and inevitable, but they were a direct invasion by business standards of the hitherto idealistic realm.

On the other hand, and illustrative of a strange inconsistency, the arguments against the "closed shop," made by the employer, are made on the general ground of the "freedom of the individual" and of "the liberty of the workingman," and are a direct carrying over of the ideal into the region of business. The term "contract shop" would be a much fairer phrase and a much more businesslike definition of the situation than the phrase "closed

shop." In such a shop, the unions say to the employer: "We are ready to sign a contract to supply you with labor for a year under union conditions of hours and wages, but we cannot sign the contract if non-union men are employed, for we have no way of holding them to the terms of the contract, as the fines and other disciplinary methods enable us to do with our own men. These non-union men have no regard for our standard of wages and hours, and are continually cutting into both. We, as a union, can make a contract with you, and agree to stick to it, only if you will keep the non-union men out." In this case, the businesslike proposition comes from the union, and the concern for ethical standards, for "American ideals," comes from the business man. It is an absolute reversal of the position that the two sides take on the subject of the sympathetic strike. To use a war simile which would certainly not be inapt, as in many cases actual war is waged, each side stays within its own battle line, one side waving a banner of idealism whenever the other side waves one of commercialism.

In this necessity for compromise which characterizes the present development of trades-unionism, the selfsame union will often conform to the tenets of its earlier idealism and at the same time hold strictly to its newly adopted business standards, the two phases of development going on together in that strange fellowship which all life presents.

A woman organizer in Chicago, who had been active in organizing the nine thousand Special Order Tailors into a successful union, was recently called to a clothing factory in which all of the girls had struck because they were given a new style of garment to work upon, which they found added fifteen minutes to each hour, and made their wages correspondingly less than they had been when they were working upon the style of garment upon which their contract was based. Six months of the year's contract still remained, with no provision for changes in style. In declaring a strike the union girls clearly violated the contract, although they were firmly convinced that it was not they, but the employer, who had done so; and, when the organizer insisted upon a return to work and a strict enforcement of the contract, she did it at the cost of cruel misunderstanding, for the girls were all firmly convinced that she had been "fixed" by the employer.

Another illustration occurs to me of the trades-union regard for contract, in which it was more rigid than that held by the em-

ploying side. Several hundred Italian women, who were "home finishers," had with much difficulty been organized by the Special Order Tailors and carefully drilled to demand the union scale. After some months, it was discovered by the officers of the union that at least in sixty-two shops these Italian women were taking two cents less a garment than the union contract had specified. After much difficulty the union officials were permitted to see the employers' books, and the withheld wages, amounting to some hundreds of dollars, were paid by the employers and put into the treasury of those locals whose members had failed to receive the agreed scale. In this case, the contract between the Employers' Association and the union was clearly violated by the employers, who had taken advantage of the ignorance of the Italian women, and the trades-union had urged the validity of the contract upon an organization of manufacturers.

Although this union is so careful in regard to contracts, curiously enough, no labor organization in Chicago at the present time is exhibiting more clearly the possession of idealism,—at least, if we measure idealism by the willingness to make sacrifices on its behalf. This union has been one of the most successful in its attempt to extend its benefits to the least skilled and most wretchedly paid. It is comparatively simple for an employer to give the skilled operatives in a clothing factory more money by taking it away from the wages of the seam-sewer and buttonholer. The fact that it results in one set of workers being helped at the expense of another set does not appeal to him, so long as he is satisfying the demand of the union without increasing the total cost of production. But the Special Order Tailors have, at the expense of their own wages and growth, made a determined effort to include even the sweat-shop workers in the benefits they have slowly secured for themselves. By means of the use of the label they were finally able to insist that no goods should be given out for home finishing save to women presenting union cards, and they have raised the wages from nine and eleven cents to the minimum wage of fifteen cents. They have also made a protest against the excessive subdivision of the labor upon garments, which enables the manufacturer to use children and the least skilled adults. Thirty-two people are commonly employed upon a single coat, and it is the purpose of the Special Order Tailors to have all the machine work upon one garment performed by one

worker, thus reducing the number working on one coat to twelve or fourteen. This change will at the same time demand more skill on the part of the operator, and increase the variety and interest in his work. At the present moment, a District Council of Garment Workers in Chicago is under indictment for having attempted to enforce a similar demand in what is known as the "vest and pants locals." In the testimony taken before the Master in Chancery, the argument was based almost entirely upon the right of the worker to a legitimate interest and pleasure in his work, and I could quote sentences from the testimony of one of the organizers against whom the injunction was issued, which could easily be mistaken for quotations from Ruskin. Indeed, these garment-makers are sacrificing both time and money for the defence of Ruskinian principles, one of the few actual attempts to recover the "joy of work," although, of course, mixed with a desire to preserve a trade from the invasion of the unskilled, and a consequent lowering of wages.

Undertakings such as these must make an appeal to unselfishness, and must break through the mere personal interest of the trades-unionists in their own higher wages. They more readily respond to this appeal in that it stirs memory of their "organization night," when they were admitted after solemn ceremonies into the American Federation of Labor. At the same time, the organizers themselves often hold out too large promises, on the sordid side, of what organization will be able to accomplish; they tell the newly initiated what other unions have done, without telling at the same time how long they have been organized and how steadily they have worked. A year ago, when there seemed to be a veritable "strike fever" in Chicago among the younger trades-unions, it was suggested in the Federation of Labor that no union be authorized to declare a strike until it had been organized for at least two years. The regulation was backed by some of the strongest and wisest trades-unionists, but it failed to pass because the organizers were convinced that it would cripple them in organizing unions; they would have to point to many months of patient payment of dues and humdrum meetings before any real gain could be secured. The organizers, in fact, are in the position of a revivalist who, in the midst of holding out hopes of heaven and future good, should have to tell his converts that there would be no chances for at least two years, or that the rewards would have

to depend upon "works," although from the start they must learn to walk by "faith."

It is a curious admixture of motive, and at the best is a wretched preparation for the life of collective bargaining and contract-keeping, into which the modern trades-union is quickly plunged without the gradual training which the older unions had, through their "mutual benefits" and other semi-benevolent and semi-business features. As a result, the newer unions are constantly held up to public scorn because they "do not keep their contracts,"—it is said that they are, indeed, utterly regardless of the validity and sacredness of a contract, upon which all business dealing rests. This necessity for business action without the requisite business training affords opportunity for never-ending difficulty. One fruitful source arises from the inexperience and vanity of the committee which represents the newly organized union at the time the contract is drawn. Usually, such a committee has no "power to act," but is expected to take the propositions back to the body of its union for ratification. The committee finds, however, that the men representing the employer have full power to act, and are, moreover, businesslike and alert in their dealings. In the course of the negotiations, the committee is led to promise certain terms, which seem to it reasonable, and it fully commits itself to these terms. It quite unconsciously assumes the tone of finality and business dealing of the other side. When the terms of the contract are finally submitted to the union for ratification, they are often "turned down," the committee being unable to reproduce effectively the arguments which sounded so cogent in the committee meeting. The committee is thus in a dilemma; it must return to the employers and tell them of its plight, at which point the employer will often meet it with the cry of broken contract, assuming that the representatives of the union had power to act for their body; or it must carry out the original terms with the employer, and tell the union that those were the best that could be made. In the latter case, the entire body will enter into the new relation with reluctance, and sometimes in a recalcitrant spirit, ready to take offence.

In passing judgment upon this obvious dereliction of trades-unions, it is well to recall the fact that, throughout his life and that of his father, the workingman has had nothing to do with contracts; he rents his tenement by the week or month and does

not sign a lease; he has been hired habitually by the day or week, with no contract to assure his continuance at work; if he offended the foreman, he might be dismissed, with or without good cause, any day in the week or any hour of the day. The old-time workman may have had theoretical freedom of contract, but he has had no actual contract. When the employer says, "I will bargain with my own men one at a time," he practically means that he will make no bargain, that he will merely enter into a relation of goodwill and good faith. None of the workman's relations in life, although they are often continuous and stable, depend for their continuity and stability upon contracts between himself and other people. His marriage contract is, perhaps, the one exception to this; but it is fortunately, to him, not a contract, but a sacrament.

The fact that the American trades-unions are receiving their first lessons in business at a moment of unusual business corruption, also tends to make the present time for them one of unusual crisis. There are practically no longer any charges of corruption against the English trades-unions. But there is undoubted evidence that many unions here are suffering from the present low standard of public morality, and share the more brutal doctrines of commercialism, which make a man declare his resolve to "get there," despite obstacles from without or scruples from within.

It is, indeed, cold comfort to say that the methods of labor organizations are "no worse" than the methods adopted by certain organizations of capital. If a small body of men become so absolutely engrossed in making money that they disregard public rights, that they bribe and browbeat railroads from their function of common carriers to that of granters of favored rates, that is certainly deplorable, but, after all, not so deplorable as when a large body of workingmen disregard public rights, and involve the honor and moral standards of many of their fellows. The first, too, is carried on by secret negotiations which may not be understood by the public until years afterward, while the second has to justify itself, from the very organization of modern trades-unionism, to the reason of hundreds of men, and must debauch their consciences in the process. It is a much more serious concern to the community when a trades-union employs questionable methods than when a business concern does, because it affects a larger proportion of the population, and in that respect is much more nearly analogous to political corruption. That trades-unionists them-

selves are perilously near to accepting the corrupt business standard as a normal one for their own dealings, there are unfortunately many evidences. Samuel Parks at one time was almost forgiven by the majority of the members of his union, who admitted that, although he had accepted bribes and extorted blackmail, he had nevertheless doubled the wages of his fellow trades-unionists, that he was engaged by them for the sake of increasing their wages, and that it was a matter of his own individual conscience as to how he proceeded to do it; that his method of procedure was no concern of theirs. Fortunately, however, the sense of honesty and fair dealing rallied later, and the national representatives refused to endorse his position. The argument was not unlike that used by the stockholders of a Chicago street-railway company, who some years ago practically admitted that their representatives had bribed the members of the Common Council and had been indifferent to the rights of the people, but who insisted that they had nevertheless managed the company effectively, had paid the stockholders a good dividend, and had even lowered fares; that such results were all that could be reasonably demanded of them, and that to go into their methods and condemn them for what their own individual consciences permitted them to do, was an impertinence. The arguments on the surface are not unlike; but it is infinitely worse for a large body of men, representing the traditions of simple people, to use these arguments, than it is for the smaller groups of business men, with their sophisticated experience, to use the same arguments. It is fortunate that the public made a more vigorous protest in one case than in the other.

Another source of corruption is the political situation found in all the large American cities. Labor-unions are naturally composed of the same men who form the units of our political life, many of whom have already had their training in corruption through their political organizations. Indeed, it is a charge made by certain "old-time" trades-unionists that the Civil Service regulations have turned out of office a number of adroit politicians, who, finding "nothing doing" in politics, have turned their attention to "grafting" among trades-unions. The Teamsters' Union, which was started in Chicago two years ago, and was equally distinguished by its phenomenal growth and brilliant achievements in connection with certain Team Owners' Associations, was composed very largely of men who lived in the river

wards. These wards are adjacent to the business quarter, and the teamsters naturally kept their horses and wagons in the vicinity of the down-town district where their work was found. The Chicago River wards have long been notorious for their well-organized political corruption, and before they joined the Teamsters' Union many of the men were already "wise" on the subject of "graft," and in the methods of manipulating large bodies of men for their own ulterior purposes. That they had learned their lesson well was shown by the early history of their organization, which illustrated the most obvious effects of political corruption upon labor organization.

It is more difficult to trace the course of that subtler form of corruption which has been in progress for many years in the Labor Movement. Every organization whose success depends upon large numbers is always susceptible to the subtler type of corruption, and instances could easily be cited from the various devices to increase their membership used by benevolent and philanthropic societies.

To many people of average ethical instinct, this collective ambition to gain as many members as possible for a given organization seems entirely praiseworthy, and the method is not scrutinized if the desired result is attained. It has certainly always been done most openly in the political field. In the early days of Chicago, before the advent of Civil Service, it had for some years been the custom for the secretary or other official of a trades-union to promise "the labor vote" to the candidate for Mayor, if he upon his election would consent to appoint a trades-union official to an inspector's position, where he would have opportunity for increasing the membership of his union. No attempt was made to conceal the motives, so long as they were impersonal. This went so far as to dictate at least one appointment of the first Civil Service Commission, whose business it was to put trades-union men into inspectors' positions. It is easy for a city inspector who is also a union man to give a contractor to understand that, unless his building has been constructed by union labor, he is going to have constant difficulty with the department, that it will be much simpler for him in the very outset to insist that all of his men shall join the union. The inspector is therefore a powerful factor in the increase of membership in all of the organizations connected with the building trades, and may regard such action

as a perfectly legitimate piece of trades-union extension. Through the coercion thus brought to bear upon the contractor, the unions grow in numbers. They are composed, however, of men who know little of the earlier aspects of the movement, and are held together not by the free acceptance of mutual obligations, but by the plain desire to "hold their jobs" under a contractor who wants his business to run smoothly.

The rapid growth of trades-unionism in the city building trades, in both Chicago and New York, and the extraordinary corruption found in connection with them, may bear more of the relation of cause and effect than is at first obvious, and the community may be congratulated that it has been so thoroughly exposed before it became a steady feature in their lives, and their corruption became interdependent with political and commercial corruption.

One would be glad to believe that this crisis of corruption is but a passing one in the Labor Movement, as we try to persuade ourselves that it is ephemeral in politics and business, "a mere incident in the triumph of industrial progress." Trades-unionists have, indeed, an unusual opportunity for ultimate honesty of administration, for collective bargaining must in the end be public bargaining, involving as it does hundreds of men.

From this point of view, it is difficult to understand why American business men have been so reluctant to concede to trades-unions the right of collective bargaining. The business men of this generation have seen the administration of property change largely from individual management to corporate management, as the directors of a stock company more and more outline the policy of the business for which they are responsible, and in which their money is invested. They have practically made a new adjustment, in regard to the administration of at least one class of property, and yet they are the very men who most resent the attempt to extend this method of bargaining, this modification of individual ownership, to workingmen. They declare that the old method, which in fact is not very old, but comparatively recent, is inviolable, and cannot be changed without an attack upon the very principle of property itself. It is a confusion between the principle of property, which has been recognized and protected throughout the existence of civilization, and the modes by which it has been governed. The

latter are unstable, and destined, like any other manifestation of life, to undergo the law of progressive development. The workmen who insist that they do not get their fair advantage from the invention of machinery, that the partition of the results of labor achieved by both proprietor and workman is not effected in just proportion, who seek to modify and correct the conditions and hours under which they labor, are really advocating a gradual change in the present constitution of property, and are pursuing the conservative method when they advocate those changes by means of collective bargaining and trade contracts. This is true in spite of the fact that these demands are often excessive and, from the business point of view, "impossible"; that they are many times accompanied by irrational use of newly acquired power; that their representatives are often corrupt and self-seeking, and that the entire movement exhibits the disorder which has accompanied both political and ecclesiastical movements whenever they have tried to change the administration of power from the aristocratic to the democratic form.

The hope of trades-unions lies in the sheer necessity for the public discussion of their affairs, for it is hard to overestimate how far mere publicity makes for morality, and in the fact that the earliest trade organizations have committed the entire movement to that growing concern for a larger and more satisfying life for every man. For, rightly or wrongly, among us all the belief daily strengthens that whatever has for its object the increased value of the universal life is thereby certified as legitimate. Whether organized labor in America will make its business adjustment and still keep this object in view, whether it will safely pass through the present crisis of transition and temptation, no one can as yet state with any degree of certainty.

It is possible, in addition to the period of transitional development and the fact that they are bearing the brunt of a vigorous onset of national corruption, that a third line of tendencies may be adduced, which make the present decade one of crisis for trades-unionists, as it is, indeed, for all of us. America is only now beginning to realize, and has not yet formulated, all the implications of the factory system, and the conditions of living which the well-established system imposes upon the workers. As we feel it closing down upon us, moments of restlessness and resentment seize us all. The protest against Mr. Mitchell's state-

ment that the American workingman has recognized that he is destined to remain a workingman, is a case in point. In their attempt to formulate and correct various industrial ills, trades-unions are often blamed for what is inherent in the factory system itself, and for those evils which can only be cured through a modification of that system. For instance, factory-workers in general have for years exhibited a tendency to regulate the output of each worker to an amount which they conisder a fair day's work, although such a restricted output may prove to be less than a fair day's work to many of the workers. The result is, of course, disastrous to the workers themselves, as well as to the factory management, for it doubtless is as bad for a man's nervous system to hold in his natural pace as to unduly accelerate it. The real trouble which this "limitation" is an awkward attempt to correct is involved in the fact that the intricate subdivision of factory work, lack of understanding on the part of employees of the finished product, has made an unnatural situation, in which the worker has no normal interest in his work or direct relation to it. In the various makeshifts on the part of the manufacturer to supply motives which shall take the place of the natural ones so obviously missing, many devices have been resorted to, such as "speeding up" machinery, "setting the pace," and substituting "piece-work" for day work. The manufacturers may justly say that they have been driven to these various expedients, not only by the factory conditions, but by the natural laziness of man; but, nevertheless, reaction from such a cause is inevitably an uncompromising attempt on the part of the workers to protect themselves from overexertion and to regulate the output. The worst cases I have ever known have occurred in unorganized shops and have been enforced by public opinion, unaided by any trades-union. The "pace-setter" in such a shop is often driven out, and treated with the same animosity as the "scab" receives in a union shop.

Although trades-unions are much blamed for this "holding back of the ambitious man," this "reducing every one to a dead level of mediocrity," and although they were the first to formulate it into a creed, to accuse them of inventing it, as is often done, is to disclose ignorance of factory conditions.

A few months ago, a noted educator complained that a reference to the "joy of labor" made before a large audience of trades-unionists produced only scorn and merriment. He instanced this

as a lack of idealism among trades-unionists, with the implication that a roomful of unorganized men would at once have responded to this shibboleth, whereas of course the factory system itself has brought them all to exactly the same place.

We are constantly confronted by large industrial changes from which the community as a whole profits, but which must inevitably bring difficulty of adjustment and disaster to men of certain trades. Doubtless, these difficulties should be distributed, and not allowed to fall altogether upon the group of working people whose labor is displaced as a result of the change. If these great industrial situations could be considered as belonging to the community as a whole, and could be reasonably dealt with, we would get rid altogether of that disgraceful attitude which the trades-unions have from time to time taken against the introduction of improved machinery,—a small group blindly attempting to defend what they consider their only chance to work. The economists have done surprisingly little to shed light upon this difficulty; indeed, they are somewhat responsible for its exaggeration, for their old theory of a "wage fund," which did not reach the rank and file of trades-unionists until at least in its first form it had been abandoned by the leading economists, has been responsible for much disorder along this line, as well as for the other mistaken attempt "to make work for more men."

If progress were inaugurated by those members of the community who possess the widest knowledge and superior moral insight, then social amelioration might be brought about without the bungling and mistakes which so distress us all. But, over and over again, salutary changes are projected and carried through by men of even less than the average ethical development, because their positions in life have brought them in contact with the ills of existing arrangements. To quote from John Morley: "In matters of social improvement, the most common reason why one hits upon a point of progress, and not another, is that the one happens to be more directly touched than the other by the unimproved practice." Perhaps this is a sufficient explanation of the fact that untrained workingmen are intrusted with the difficult task of industrial amelioration and adjustment, and that trades-unions, which are the organized expression of that effort, are the most significant organizations in our midst, and their code of morality our deepest concern.

JANE ADDAMS.

OBSTACLES TO REFORM IN TURKEY.

BY CHARLES MORAWITZ.

THE obstacles which, in the Ottoman Empire, oppose the execution of those reforms that are so desirable and are so constantly demanded, are of three kinds: they arise, firstly, from the extraordinary and curious variety of the peoples classed together pell-mell under the name of Ottoman; secondly, from the character of the Turkish race; and, lastly, from the attitude of foreign Powers.

I.

No exact or even approximate census has ever been taken of the peoples who, with or against their will, recognize the Sultan of Constantinople as their sovereign. These statistics would, however, possess only a relative value. Moreover, such a census would be impossible in a country like Turkey, where an important part of the population leads a nomadic life, and where the civil organization exists only in a rudimentary form, or is even totally lacking. But so much is certain, that the territory from Novi-Bazar to the Persian Gulf, and from the frontier of Russian Armenia to the Red Sea, respectively, contains the most varied and inharmonious collection of human elements conceivable.

In European Turkey alone, there are no fewer than eleven races, and the number of churches is greater still. This extraordinary diversity, together with the rivalry existing between the various Christian races and sects, would be in itself a great impediment to the introduction of administrative and judicial reforms; but it is further aggravated by the fact that certain tribes, such as the Albanians, for example, are partly Christians and partly Mohammedans, and that each of the various religious communities possesses a certain degree of autonomy.

The sense of uniformity has always been singularly wanting

in the Turkish race. Terrible and often cruel conquerors as they have been, they have never asked more of those subjected by them than to remain quiet and pay the taxes levied upon them. They have left them not only their religion, their clergy, their language, but even their civil organization, and, in all matters of domestic jurisprudence, their own tribunal.

The part played by standing armies in certain countries in forming a bond of union between the various nationalities of the state has never been accomplished by the Turkish army. Greeks, Armenians and Turks have not the opportunity of uniting and fraternizing under the national flag. In a great measure from contempt, but in some degree from distrust, the Mussulman Turks have reserved to themselves the exclusive privilege of military service; they have excluded from it all the non-Mohammedan subjects of the Sultan, and they content themselves with imposing upon these a small tax for their exemption from military service, which is, as a rule, very willingly paid. Thus there is nothing to unite the different races. The Turks avoid anything likely to bring about a *rapprochement*, and carefully endeavor to maintain the existing antagonism, which they regard as a pledge of their own security. "*Divide et impera*" has been the rule observed for centuries by the Turks both towards their own subjects and towards the Great Powers.

A uniform legislation, a common administration, making no discrimination between people of different religion and origin, would be far from welcome to the races living side by side in the valleys of the Vardar or the Euphrates, on the slopes of the Balkans or Ararat,—races always jealous of each other, and sometimes at open war. Too heterogeneous to submit to unity of law and government, too far reduced by centuries of migrations, troubles and wars to gather together in provinces according to their various nationalities, these peoples offer to the reformer the most stubborn and recalcitrant material imaginable.

II.

Originally a nomadic and military race, established in the midst of subjugated populations, and become sedentary only at a comparatively recent period, the Turks have retained to this day a number of their former habits and instincts. In order to be convinced of this it is sufficient to visit one of their private houses or

Government offices. In the former, there is no permanently fitted up bedroom or dining-room; in the evening, a few rugs, thrown upon a divan, suffice for a couch, and all meals are served upon a tray and eaten with the fingers. In public offices, there are none of those imposing portfolios and vast cupboards which are the obligatory accompaniments of our Government routine; the documents are carried about in sacks, and kept in sacks, if they are kept at all. In Constantinople, in the palaces of high functionaries and in the business of Government departments, certain Western practices have filtered in; but they are very far from having entirely banished the old national customs, and in the provinces these customs have maintained their sway almost intact.

As modern civilization develops in a nation, so much the more does existence there become intense and feverish and every minute have its value. The Mussulman is never in a hurry. Even in war, where the Ottoman soldier has recently shown himself to be worthy of his glorious traditions, he is distinguished by tenacity rather than by the power of rapid attack. In civil affairs, and especially in Government business, the Turkish official does not know what it means to hurry himself, and, exceedingly patient himself, he does not understand impatience in others. He is quite surprised to hear a Westerner, after waiting for several hours, which he has passed in smoking cigarettes and drinking coffee, complain that the person with whom he had an appointment at noon only appears at two or three o'clock!

To the Turk of the present day, as to his ancestor of the time of the Mustaphas and Selims, time has no value, and the notion of an exact due date does not exist. When he has signed a contract or promise to pay at a specified date, or when he has undertaken to carry out some obligation or other in a given time, the date or the term has not the same meaning to his mind as it has to ours. It still remains for him something indefinite. It is not bad faith on his part; it is simply want of power to connect, as we are accustomed to do, the idea of an engagement with that of a strictly limited period of time.

Another extremely serious difficulty lies in the fact that the social and political condition of Turkey has not yet passed a stage which the other nations of Europe have left behind them long since, and of which the last trace disappeared from the West about thirty years ago with the temporal power of the Popes. The man-

agement of public business is not yet entirely secularized in the Ottoman Empire. It is not only that the Sultan unites in his person the double quality of lay sovereign and religious chief. But below him, even in the judicial organization indispensable to national existence, the line is not clearly defined between what concerns the State and what lies within the domain of the Church. Although a certain number of codes dictated by modern intelligence have been promulgated, the Koran still remains the text of the law, as well as the Sacred Book. The Sheik-ul-Islam is invested with a kind of veto upon matters connected with legislation. The body of the Ulémas, placed under his orders, are at the same time clergy and magistrates.

A society thus organized, partly theocratic, partly military, furnished with a somewhat rudimentary and far from perfect administrative organization, has existed during hundreds of years almost without contact with the Western World. Then, almost suddenly, during the second half of the last century, the barrier was lowered. Turkey borrowed money from the Great Powers of Europe and threw open her gates to them. She received from them military instructors, high functionaries, and engineers who constructed railways and harbors for her. The still primitive régime of the Ottoman Empire found itself suddenly face to face with the most advanced civilization. The monarchy of the Sultans felt the requirements of a modern state, while possessing only the machinery of a mediæval administration. Can one wonder that her institutions are ill adapted to such an evolution?

There is, however, one institution imported from abroad which has taken root without much trouble in Turkish soil. This is bureaucracy, with its necessary complement of multitudinous documents. The employees of the state are badly paid: often, indeed, they are not paid at all, and live as best they can, rather ill than well, at the expense of those under their administration; but their name is legion. Commerce and industry, those factors of the wealth and power of a nation, are but little practised by the Turks, who show a marked preference for Government posts.

The Effendi knows scarcely any other career than that of theologian, soldier or civil servant. If he has no patron, he chooses an ecclesiastic career, being drawn towards it by that religious spirit which characterizes the Mussulman population. But, if he

has a few connections, he enters the army, or demands a post in the administration. The idea of aristocracy is unknown to the Mussulman; this is clearly shown by the fact that family names do not exist. In a country where there are no privileged classes, where everybody may aspire to the highest posts, it is only too natural that the Effendi, accustomed to see people attain honor and fortune who had no other claim but that of having managed to get into the good graces of some ephemeral potentate, should choose in preference a career which opens the same prospect to himself. To please his superiors is in his eyes the sole means of insuring success. .

Commerce, despised by the Effendi, is almost entirely in the hands of Armenian, Greek, Jewish and foreign merchants. Manufactures are but little developed. It was not always thus; and, in this respect, but little regard is shown to the maxims of the Koran, which orders every Mussulman to work, after the example of the patriarchs. The early Sultans all had a profession, and certain of them pushed respect for the Koran to such a point as to wish to live only by the products of their manual labor, which the courtiers were eager to purchase,—most probably without beating down the price! There exist in the country numerous traces of a very advanced civilization. Are not the names of Damascus, Mosul and Pergamos the proof of the existence of former flourishing industries, of damasquined arms, muslin and parchment? The manufacture of pottery and leather was also formerly very highly developed. These ancient industries are for the most part extinct or in decay; with the exception of carpets, agricultural products form Turkey's sole export to foreign countries at the present day. And although agriculture is the principal branch of national activity, it is far from attracting as much attention from Government as it deserves.

The fact that the Minister presiding over this department has no voice in the Council of Ministers, and the other fact that the budget provides for no expenditure on the part of this department, are in themselves sufficiently characteristic.

All travellers coming from Western and Central Europe to Constantinople by rail can appreciate this melancholy situation by comparing it with the prosperous condition of the soil in Eastern Roumelia. Hardly have they crossed the frontier when they are painfully impressed, first in the territory of Mustapha Pacha,

and especially in the long stretch from Adrianople to the capital, by the low standard of cultivation, which is on the contrary so flourishing round Philippopolis.

Among the numerous causes of this condition we may mention the want of means of communication, which renders the sale of surplus production so difficult; the imperfect knowledge of scientific agriculture, which causes the Turkish peasant of to-day to plough, sow, and reap his crops after the manner of his forefathers; and the very arbitrary assessment of taxes, still more aggravated by the abuses of collection. If, moreover, we take into consideration the unlucky system of *vakoufs* or mortmain property, which comprises three-quarters of the country, we can only wonder that Turkey is still counted among European states having the largest export of agricultural products, and this fact permits us to imagine what brilliant results might be obtained in other conditions.

Let us now put together the different features of the sketch which has been given above. We see a military people established by conquest in the midst of races which they have not attempted to assimilate, retaining, as they do, a very exalted sentiment of superiority over the vanquished, not attempting to vie with them in commercial and industrial occupations; some applying themselves to a rudimentary form of agriculture, or to public offices which are as uninteresting as they are badly paid; others embracing the military profession, in which the repression of internal insurrections represents the only form of active service: a people honest at bottom with the exception of a very small minority which has learned nothing from European civilization but its vices, together with that class of employees reduced by poverty to live on bakshish: a people devoid of all spirit of initiative, reduced to inertia by Mussulman fatalism and the most primitive kind of public instruction. Let us imagine this people as governed by sovereigns who are occasionally animated by excellent intentions, but who have been brought up in private and under suspicion, guarded from all contact with outside life by an absurd system of succession,—sovereigns whose power is theoretically absolute, but who in any desire for reform would immediately find themselves in conflict with the narrow-mindedness of a powerful clergy which is dominated by custom. On thinking of all this, one cannot be surprised that a great reformer has not yet gone forth from the

palaces of Dolma-Bagtché, Tscheragan or Yildiz. It is true that the Russia of the seventeenth century presented conditions not much more favorable than these, that the education of Peter the Great had not prepared him any better for the part that he played in later life; and that, nevertheless, he succeeded in liberating Russia from a political and social condition which was far more Asiatic than is that of Turkey at the present day. In history everything is possible, even the appearance of a Peter the Great on the shores of the Bosphorus!

III.

A third factor still remains to be mentioned, the cooperation of which might be very efficacious and the zeal of which has often been manifested. I speak of the foreign Powers; but it must be frankly admitted that hitherto they have accomplished their mission of counsellors and guardians only in a very intermittent and imperfect fashion. It is true that they have on several occasions demanded reforms, notably in the Treaties of Paris and Berlin, but all the arrangements relative to these have remained a dead letter, and it could hardly be denied that the Powers have done nothing to encourage Turkey to continue the work of reform once commenced. A single one of the European provinces of Turkey, Eastern Roumelia, had received a definite organization. The commission formed in virtue of the Treaty of Berlin had elaborated for this province an organic statute, a regular administrative charter. After a few years of working, this statute was forcibly destroyed. Eastern Roumelia has become, in fact, a Bulgarian province. Diplomacy has looked on impassively at this flagrant violation of a treaty when the ink of its signatures was hardly dry. This precedent has clearly done not a little to diminish the authority of diplomacy in demanding the "organization" of Macedonia or Thrace, and was not likely to stimulate the zeal of the Sultan to create other "Eastern Roumelias."

It must also be recognized that the system of "capitulations," as it is practised, does not testify to the disinterestedness necessary to gain that influence over Turkish governmental circles which is desirable for the realization of the reforms demanded. Capitulations — diplomatic treaties concluded during past centuries—offered to foreigners who had settled in Turkey, among other advantages, notably that of having their legal actions judged

by their own consulates, and not by the tribunals of the country. These arrangements had their *raison d'être*, and they have it still. Even to-day it would be imprudent to subject foreigners settled in Turkey to Ottoman jurisdiction; but these old conventions, and especially the customary rights which have become established in their train and which are found in no legal document, maintain certain other privileges which it would be difficult to justify.

Perhaps I may be permitted to quote a few examples in support of this assertion. On the basis of a right drawn by interpretation from the obscure text of the capitulations, there still exist the post-offices established by the Powers in the large cities and the majority of the ports, offices of which the first was opened by Austria at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Many circumstances —such as, for instance, the excessive activity developed by the "*Cabinet Noir*,"* and the fact, characteristic of the existing state of affairs, that a local postal service does not exist in the capital, for fear that it might be favorable to conspiracies—justify the maintenance of these foreign post-offices. But would it be more than the most elementary justice to abandon to the Turkish state a part of the profits which the Powers derive from them, and to recognize its right of suzerainty, either by the settlement of a percentage upon the profits or by the arrangement that letters are not to be forwarded unless, in addition to the foreign stamp, they also bear a Turkish stamp?

The majority of the nations of the Continent of Europe are endeavoring to protect their industries and agriculture against foreign competition, and even England, the bulwark of Free Trade, is considering whether she should not follow this example. Disciples of Colbert and Chamberlain when it is a question of closing their own frontiers, they suddenly become followers of Cobden in order not to allow any customs barriers worth mentioning at the entrance to the Ottoman Empire. The tariff voted by their parliaments abounds in taxes of 15, 20 and 25 per cent. on the value of goods imported by them. But the Turks are not allowed to exceed 8 per cent., and a thousand difficulties are raised when they ask permission to impose an additional three or four per cent.

* The term applied on the Continent of Europe to the department in Government Post-offices which violates the secrecy of private correspondence.

The Powers show no more signs of a spirit of equity when they exact quite exceptional fiscal immunities for their subjects established in Turkey. One can understand that they wish to protect their subjects against exactions such as were often committed formerly, as might still be committed if no control were exercised; but this is no reason why foreigners settled in Turkey should be exempt from personal and direct taxes which are very reasonable, very moderate, and are imposed on Turkish subjects—for instance, the tax upon commercial and industrial incomes. The history of the attempts made for many years by the Porte to remedy inequality of treatment, as regards this last tax, is sufficiently characteristic to deserve to be given in some detail.

The Ottoman Empire is still subject, in certain points, to those corporate institutions which all Europe was familiar with in the Middle Ages, and which had almost entirely disappeared by the end of the eighteenth or beginning of the nineteenth century. There still exist there a large number of professional associations of skilled and unskilled laborers, strongly organized, invested with monopolies sanctioned by long tradition and of which they are extremely jealous, and ready to use violence, if need be, to defend their privileges. All travellers who have visited Constantinople, or any other great port of the Empire, have seen one of these trades-unions at work, the "*hamals*" or porters, syndicated in every important locality under the orders of leaders to whom they render implicit obedience. These "*hamals,*" who have secured by financial means powerful supporters even in the immediate entourage of the Sultan, fix their own tariffs and impose their assistance upon both private individuals and transport companies, driving away in the most effectual manner, with fist and knife, all who attempt to compete with them. The police dare not oppose their extortions. The merchants suffer from their tyranny; every one complains of them; but the complaints of the public and of the Embassies against the monopoly of the *hamals* attached to the administration of the custom-house at Constantinople, and the claims put forward by foreign merchants to have their goods transported by their own employees, remain without the slightest effect. All have to pass under the caudine forks of the *hamals.*

In the same way, another corporation of the capital, as mischievous as it is picturesque, the *Tolumbadjis* or voluntary firemen, has resisted all efforts to abolish it. As soon as the cannon

sounds the alarm of fire, one sees wild and noisy hordes rushing up, carrying their primitive hand-pumps, and terrifying the inhabitants by their cries. They take up their position round the burning house, bargain for the rate of salvage before beginning the work of extinguishing the flames, and more often than not steal more than they save. They are more to be feared than the fire itself. They have not the slightest *raison d'être* since the organization of an excellent body of firemen after the European pattern by the administration, with the intelligent cooperation of Count Szechenyi. No matter! The *Tolumbadji,* privileged like the *hamal,* continues to exist. It is asserted that the actual number of members of the two bodies, together with the persons dependent upon them, reaches the figure of 30,000 in Constantinople alone. The Sultan, who is anxious for peace and quiet, shrinks from causing annoyance to such turbulent elements of the population. In such matters, contrary to received opinion, the most absolute Governments are sometimes the most timid.

Not alone upon the shores of the Bosphorus, but in a great many other parts of Turkey, the old system of "wardenships" and "freedoms" still exists, just as it did in past centuries all over Europe. It is necessary to be thoroughly acquainted with them to understand what seems at first sight one of the most singular anomalies of the system of "capitulations." These venerable conventions applied the principles of free trade between Turkey and several of the states of Central and Western Europe, and that, too, at a period when political economy was still ignorant of them theoretically and they were quite unknown in practice. "In order to bring about that activity in trade and that safety to travellers coming and going which naturally result in friendly relations," they guaranteed the greatest facilities in the exchange of goods, and, to the subjects of the countries which were parties to them, the almost unlimited right of settling in Turkey for the purposes of trade. But the application of liberal ideas stops there. As soon as we pass from the sphere of trade, properly so called, to that of manufacture, as soon as it becomes a question, not of the power of trafficking, buying or selling, but of producing or manufacturing, the principles are entirely changed: the narrowest form of protection and nationalism takes the place of free trade. The exercise of the trades reserved to the corporations is forbidden to foreigners. Nor can foreigners join the corporations.

As a matter of fact, this ancient Chinese wall of rights and privileges has not failed to suffer a few breaches here and there. Foreign workmen and manufacturers have established themselves in Turkey. Nothing, even in the text of the capitulations, prevents their working in those cities where trades-unions for such and such professions do not exist. Furthermore, a certain number of individuals who are not subjects of the Sultan have opened workshops or accepted employment in the European quarters of the majority of the great cities, thanks to the more or less interested tolerance of the authorities. But, none the less, the rule exists; in more than one case, the corporations have insured respect for it by rendering a prolonged residence in the locality intolerable to the intruder who is sufficiently audacious to compete with them, and by employing to this end either incessant small vexations or more energetic means of persuasion.

When, after the war of 1876-77, Turkey conceived the notion of replacing her ancient tax of "*temettu*" by something more conformable to modern ideas, when she desired to establish a rational tax upon the produce of commerce and industry, she naturally intended that this tax should also be levied upon the subjects of other states, who were until that time exempt from all contributions in virtue of the capitulations. This was a legitimate desire enough. But, in order to realize it, the consent of the Powers was indispensable. Recognizing that there would be an injustice in establishing an equal rate of fiscal dues for all the inhabitants of the Empire without regard to nationality, at the same time that the restrictions imposed upon freedom of manufacture were still being maintained to the disadvantage of foreigners, the Government inserted in the bill imposing a tax upon patents an article by the terms of which "all the inhabitants of the Empire, without any reservation, are granted the free exercise of industries of all kinds, of trades carried on by corporations and of all professions whatever in general." It might have been thought that, upon this basis, an agreement between Turkey and the Powers would be established without much difficulty. Such a supposition would imply ignorance of the usual course of events at Constantinople. Negotiations began, as slowly as usual. They were following their ordinary course, when Russia condemned them to certain failure by declaring that she would make her adhesion dependent upon the suppression of trades-unions.

There were certainly in theory some good reasons for this demand. As long as the corporations exist, it will be difficult to consider industrial liberty as absolutely guaranteed, at any rate for the small producer and the workingman. The entire abolition of the corporations is, however, almost impossible for reasons given above. Rather than run the risk of provoking demonstrations, perhaps riots, and in any case discontent, the Sultan prefers to follow that course which is the easiest in every country, and towards which the Oriental in particular is naturally inclined, the course of doing nothing; and thus the bill of patents continues to moulder in the archives.

In the mean time, the situation of the foreigner engaged in trade in Turkey is in reality highly enviable, at least from a fiscal point of view. This lucky individual has the privilege of belonging to a state which protects him, but to which he does not pay taxes because he does not live in it; and of residing in another state to which he does not pay taxes either, because he is not a subject of it, and because century-old conventions confer upon him an almost complete immunity from taxation. He is only subject to the land-tax if he is an owner of house property. The other direct taxes do not concern him.

If he lived in his native country, in France or Austria, for example, Government officials would treat him with the majestic contempt which all administrators are in the habit of displaying towards the vulgar herd. Established at Constantinople, or in some other seaport of the East, he becomes a unit of a Great Power. A series of officials, encompassed by the immense prestige which these posts confer, ambassadors, secretaries of all ranks, attachés, dragomans, consuls-general, consuls and clerks, watch over the least of his rights with a jealous care, ready to interfere if he has the slightest dispute with the local authorities.

Certainly this system has had its *raison d'être,* and has it still. Ottoman administration and justice are not as yet, nor will be for a long time, sufficiently worthy of confidence for the stranger established in Turkey to be altogether subjected to them. Granted: but still those excesses might be avoided which may have had their reason in former times but are no longer justified to-day. There is no serious reason in favor of excepting from the payment of all direct taxes, with the exception of the land-tax, a Frenchman, German, Austrian or Englishman who has his home

and business in the Ottoman Empire: of leaving indefinitely foreigners who are the permanent guests of Turkey in the enjoyment of a system which confers upon them all rights without laying upon them any burdens: of preventing the Turkish Government from realizing an important and legitimate step in financial progress, because this progress would impose expenditure upon the local protégés of the Powers. This is to take up an attitude which is unworthy of European diplomacy, and is of a nature to give the Turks a strange idea of the Western spirit of justice.

These explanations show that, whether internally or externally, an attempt at reform in Turkey is beset with great difficulties.

It would be unjust, however, for this account of the situation to produce too pessimistic an impression, and so prevent justice being done to the progress realized during the last fifty years. On the eve of the Crimean War, the country was as firmly closed to the rest of Europe as are Persia and Afghanistan to-day. It is only since that time that Turkey has begun to open her doors to modern culture. Railways have placed her in communication with her neighbors: Salonica and Constantinople are less than three days' journey from Paris; a long line connects the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus with the heart of Anatolia. The great fiscal reform inaugurated in 1881 by the decree of Mouharrem, by insuring the punctual payment of interest upon the National Debt, has created a powerful and regular financial administration, extending the network of its agencies over the whole country, and giving an excellent example of order, regularity and good management to the other public institutions.

On examining what, in spite of all difficulties, has been accomplished in Turkey during the last half-century, we have no right to believe that she is irretrievably condemned to immobility, or to contest the possibility of a march of progress beyond the limits already attained, or to maintain that the sole means of insuring her progress is to expel the dominant race to Asia, where it originated—at the cost of a war which might set the Old World in a blaze.

The peaceful transformation of the Sultan's Empire is a question of time and of patience; it depends above all on the goodwill, firmness and union of the Powers.

CHARLES MORAWITZ.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PROBATION.

BY THE LATE CHARLTON T. LEWIS.

THE study of the methods by which society should deal with crime is, strictly, a scientific inquiry. Detailed and individual facts, historical events, anecdotes of personal experience, are all valuable in their place, but are not the main objects of attention in such a research. To reach any solution of this great question, and even to understand it clearly, we must study human nature, and keep in view its capacities and the laws by which habits and character are formed and modified. Here is the supreme difficulty in making the principles of penological science understood, whether at the university or in the lecture room. The value and importance of the study of penal law are unquestioned: but the text-books in use are likely to be misleading; and the course of procedure in our courts is no less so. For the prevailing traditions of penal law and of its administration are full of assumptions, of pretended principles, which are at war with the facts of human nature and are hindrances to progress.

Our penal codes rest upon an attempt to classify crimes, as if they were substantive things, being capable of definition and comparison, creatures which can be classed in genera and species. The law defines manslaughter, arson, burglary, robbery, larceny, as if each offence were the product of a distinct human character and conclusive evidence of a distinct degree of guilt: so that, when the name is given to an act, the deserts of the perpetrator can be inferred from it. The entire system is absurd. We are dealing, not with acts but with actors, not with deeds but with men, not with abstractions but with human hearts, minds and lives.

The supremely significant and instructive fact, in the dealings of society with crime in our day, and one which has not been fully grasped as yet by the legal profession, not even by those who

practise in criminal courts, and who should be familiar with it, is this: We have now two classes of institutions fundamentally distinct in character and purpose, both of which are designed by society, erected and conducted at public expense, for the purpose of dealing with criminals. The most numerous class of these institutions consists of prisons, in which to confine men for terms specified by the trial courts as penalties for their offences. The laws, under which offenders are sentenced to these prisons, aim at classifying crimes according to the degree of guilt they imply, and assigning to each of them the penalty which it deserves. Thus, to these prisons are sent men sentenced to confinement for two, five, ten, fourteen, or thirty years, or for life, according to the name which the law attaches to the crime proved upon them; and each man, when he has served the prescribed term, is turned loose upon society. The other class of institutions includes what are known as "reformatories." The fundamental principle here is that an offender is sent to them not for a term, but for a specified work. It is assumed that his character and habits unfit him for social life. For reasons to be found in his own nature, he cannot yet be trusted with freedom and the responsibilities of citizenship. But he may possess the capacity to become an honest, industrious, and useful citizen. To the Reformatory, then, he is sent to be educated; to be trained to habits of industry; above all, to be disciplined in the habit of looking forward to the future with the consciousness that his welfare and happiness to-morrow depend on his conduct to-day, and that he is constantly shaping his own destiny. He is expected to remain until it satisfactorily appears that this training is effective, and he may then go forth with a prospect of leading an honest and respectable life. This, in brief, is the distinction between these two classes of institutions.

For a generation past, these two kinds of prisons have been standing side by side in New York, Massachusetts, and other States. Each of them has received many thousands of criminals under sentence for grave offences. Each of them has sent out thousands of inmates into the world of human society, with whatever impress the life, teachings, and associations of the institutions could make upon their natures, as a preparation for their after career. What is the result? It is definitely known to every one who has taken the trouble to study the official and recorded facts, that a large majority of those who have been sent to the

traditional prison and discharged after serving the prescribed terms, have returned to a criminal career and have taken their places among the habitual and, so to speak, the professional enemies of society: and that a large majority of those offenders who have been sent to the second class of institutions, have been successfully trained to industry and to lawful living, and have become self-supporting citizens.

On this subject, I do not assume to give statistics, with percentages of the number of discharged inmates relapsed or reformed, in either class of prisons. There are no satisfactory records of discharged convicts; numerical accuracy is not attainable in respect even to repeated convictions for crime; while there is no scientific basis of comparison as yet between the two classes of institutions, which would justify asserting a precise or even an approximate ratio of value to each. But the broad, general fact, that a large majority of these wards of the State are, by one mode of treatment, consigned to the criminal class and to final ruin, and that a large majority of them are, by the other mode of treatment, saved to society, is far within the limits of known experience, and will not be disputed by any one who has given intelligent attention to the subject. What is the reason of the difference?

The Principle of Probation is the key to the whole subject: it is the touchstone of the difference between these two classes of institutions. This principle is not a fanciful theory nor a sentiment, but a truth, fixed and fundamental in the facts and science of human nature. All human life is a probation—that is, every man is on trial during his life, in the general sense that what he does to-day determines his welfare to-morrow. We are the framers of our own future. We cannot put our hands in the fire and burn them off, and then have the use of them in after days; nor can we clog and mutilate our souls with filth and crime, and to-morrow have the proper use of them as human souls again. The supreme training of every child, until he becomes able to take his place as a man in the world, is to have this principle of probation impressed upon him; to become conscious that in every act and movement of his thoughts, affections and will, he is shaping his own future; that, in the language of psychological science as truly as in that of the preacher, "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." He who fully learns this is the

educated man; he who learns this and acts upon it is the wise and good man. He who has not learned it is the infant, while he who has learned to live in violation of it, is the criminal. Children and criminals are much alike, in that nearly all criminals, like children, have an imperfect sense of the responsibility for the future imposed on them by the present moment.

Examine the mental habits of a body of such offenders as are sent to one of our penal institutions, and you will find that seven out of every ten of them are incapable of looking forward to anything like a remote future. They have to be taken in hand like children, almost like intelligent animals, and slowly and painfully taught the elementary fact of life and experience, that the future is the creation of the present, that to-morrow is cast in the mould of to-day. When you have succeeded in making the criminal who comes under your control or into your school realize that he must suffer to-morrow if he violates a law to-day, when you impress him with the sense of this law of life, so that he bears it continually with him, and restrains himself because of it, you have taught him the first step in the great lesson of reform. When he is so far trained in this principle that his consciousness of it can withstand the shock of sudden temptation and the long weariness of delayed recompense, so that his life is governed habitually by the aim and purpose to shape his future day by day, hour by hour, he has achieved his education and is prepared to take his place in the world as a man among men. Probation, then, is the law of education and reform. Long experience has taught us that the building up of this sense of the future is the end of all right methods of discipline for criminals. The deadly influence of the old-fashioned prison, as its inmates always say, "takes the heart out of a man." It incapacitates him for human society. Whatever disposition he had to live for the future, and it was weak and imperfect in nearly all, and needed support, guidance, and invigoration, was expelled or destroyed by entrance into the class of convicts. There is nothing for him thenceforth but to be a criminal, to revolve between crime in free life and its punishment in prison. Society spends much of its energy in impressing on the criminal the hopelessness of his condition. There are few even of the benevolent who will associate with him, who will not, on any occasion which brings them into contact with him, show their feeling of suspicion and aversion.

The aim of the Reformatory, then, is to apply the principle of probation by making life within its walls a probationary life; a life in which this principle shall become incorporated in the very consciousness and soul of the offender. But it must be remembered that while a man is in confinement, subject to the discipline of a penal institution, a true probation is almost impossible. What we mean by probation is a course of life in freedom and in society: that is to say, its essential elements are that there shall be liberty of choice from hour to hour between evil and good, and that this choice shall be continuously exercised under the social influences which come with fellowship and intercourse, under all the relations of neighbor, friend, family, and fellow citizen. Without these two elements in union, there can be no natural and perfect probation. If you take away a man's freedom, not merely in the technical sense of placing him within stone walls, but by putting him under iron discipline, where every act is pre-arranged and regulated for him so that his life in every detail is determined by others—his rising, his meals, his labor, his exercises, his conversation, all ordered by rigid rules and limited by narrow restrictions—you suppress the activity of his will and make him largely a machine. You destroy that personal freedom which is the chief formative and upholding power in character. You limit to the narrowest field those exercises of the will by which we direct and control every detail of our lives. It is not easy to realize how many decisions one makes in a day. How many acts of choice are performed by one's volition? Every movement of one's body, every word one utters is the result of an act of the will dependent upon considerations in the mind which determine it. Throw a man into prison under its severe discipline, and that experience is largely taken from him; he becomes, in all matters of moment, an instrument in the hands of the law and the officers of the institution. At the same time that his freedom is destroyed, all social influences are taken from him. The chief agency for the general and proper development of human nature is the fellowship of mankind. But, in prison, free and natural conversation is impossible; companionship and sympathy are restricted: the social basis of the soul is taken from under it.

Thus, in confinement, the two essential elements of human life, as a probation, are destroyed, and with all efforts it is impossible adequately to replace them. Great and beneficial as the work of

our Reformatories has been, it is hampered and narrowed at every point by the impossibility of reconciling imprisonment in any form, with a degree of freedom and of true companionship which will answer to the demands of the principle of probation, and give it full efficiency. Hence, it is of prime importance that, to the utmost extent possible, the probationer shall be kept outside of the walls of institutions, and apart from their discipline and their solitude. If you would reform the probationer of criminal tendencies, you must place him under social conditions and where his power of will is continually exercised. You cannot give him the power to choose good, unless you give him also the power to choose evil. In order that he may be drawn to use his power of choice for good and not for evil, you must surround him with all the influences for right and for strength of character that you can command. During the formative period of life, the acts, the sayings, the very looks and atmosphere of those around us are at work upon our natures, shaping their growth. The weak need these influences even more than the strong. Those who have criminal tendencies need them more than those who are free from such tendencies. Hence, it comes to pass, not as an impression, a mere theory, a philanthropic dream, but as a scientific fact which lies at the basis of all true penal law and administration, that, in order to reform men whose natures are prone to crime and to save them to society, their personal freedom must be conserved to the utmost extent that is safe for others, and they must be surrounded with social influences as natural and as strong as those which other men enjoy. In other words, the ideal of reformatory efficiency would be attained by a society which should itself become the probation officer for those who have gone astray; a community, which, as a whole, should exercise supervision over them, should follow their daily life with affectionate care and kindness, should extend the sympathy of human brotherhood to them in trial and under temptation, should furnish them with a guidance and a leadership which will tend to keep them in the right way.

This ideal is not, of course, attainable, in a community like ours. It would be idle to expect it, under the conditions of our industrial society, with the concentrated and yet shifting masses of population in our cities, and with our traditional horror of the criminal as the foe of mankind. But the disposition and desire

to save all that is capable of reformation in the wreckage of character and life, to compensate in some degree those who have failed for want of the education and influences freely given to others, may well become general, when the principles by which such reform is possible are clearly understood. Society will then gradually devise the agencies which are best for the work, and will support and inspire them by its own beneficent and intelligent purpose.

In this brief paper, it is possible only to suggest broad considerations, which may tend to correct and complete our ideas of penal law and administration. It is by obtaining rational attention to the subject, and by the formation of a sound public opinion upon it, in accordance with true principles of social science, that any valuable reform can be effected. To this end, one pregnant thought must be kept in mind. All that has been done in recent times to mitigate the ferocity of penal laws, and to make organized society the savior instead of the destroyer of its most unfortunate class, has been done by introducing hope to the prisoner. On the door of the jail of the old style was written: "Leave hope behind, all ye who enter here." The new gospel of penal law, the new doctrine of social science, is to make the prison the home of hope. When a wrong-doer is brought to its gate, let him in, saying: "Here is a place of rest, until you are able to go forth, as we feel assured you will, to do a man's work in the world." Hope is the stimulus of effort; the prospect of creating a future is the motive for doing well in the present. Religion and science, whatever conflict they may have or be imagined to have in aught else, are at one in this fundamental truth; and in accordance with it all penal laws should be framed and all penal institutions conducted. With this principle clearly in view, we should know that it is the extreme of folly, and is treason to society, to send an habitual or professional criminal, a depraved nature with no sense of order or restraint of conscience, out into the world, whether he has served a term of years in prison or not; and that every such enemy of mankind should be confined until his character is changed and his future honesty of life reasonably assured. But, on the other hand, it is but fair to cite a remarkable paper in the "Nineteenth Century and After" for February, written by an intelligent man who has served as a convict a term of imprisonment in a British State Prison. He gives

a striking and, doubtless, a correct account of the character of the habitual criminals with whom he was associated. He knew them by thousands, in the course of his career; but among them all there were but two whom he could regard as wholly incapable of reform. The rest were habitual criminals because there was no other life open to them; because of the want of that element of hope which is the motive power of true life. You cannot reform without it; you cannot even sustain in law-abiding citizenship the mass of our fellow men who are not criminals, without it. How, then, can we ask the man who has fallen, who meets all the obstacles of weakness, of habit, of discouragement, of bad repute, to overcome them without the inspiration of hope? This is the one force which moves humanity onward. Put it into the heart and life of the convict, and the work of reform is begun, his salvation is nearer than he or the world has believed. He is brought into touch with the movement of the race towards light, with the cheerful and confident promise of a nobler future which inspired the greatest poet of our age to cry:

> "Though the rough kex break
> The starr'd mosaic, and the beard-blown goat
> Hang on the shaft, and the wild fig-tree split
> Their monstrous idols, care not while we hear
> A trumpet in the distance pealing news
> Of better, and Hope, a poising eagle, burns
> Above the unrisen morrow."

CHARLTON T. LEWIS.

MORE TRUTH ABOUT WOMAN IN INDUSTRY

BY ELIZABETH CARPENTER.

After a most plausible array of disheartening facts about "Woman in Industry," Mrs. Flora McDonald Thompson, in the May number of the North American Review, draws her final equation of the whole matter in this wise:

I. "The practice of so-called economic independence has achieved for woman financial results indicated in the fact that her average earnings are less than one dollar a day.

II. "The effect of the practice upon economic interests is to lessen efficiency and to increase the cost of production.

III. "The effect upon the woman herself is to impair her physical fitness for the maternal function, and to subject her to a false system of education, which mentally and morally unfits her for her economic office in the family.

IV. "The effect upon society is to promote pauperdom, both by increasing the expense of living, and by robbing men of the responsibility which gives them force and success in their natural office of dispenser of wealth to the family."

In a supreme burst of pessimism, this trenchant summary concludes: "In a word, the truth about woman in industry is, she is a frightful failure."

Can all these things be as depressingly proven as Mrs. Thompson would fain have us believe? Let us see.

The first assumption is that the average woman earns less than one dollar a day; but, according to the writer's own testimony, the normal woman in industry is "the woman wholly or in part supported by others." Here lies a fact upon the very surface of the argument which at once stamps the whole comparison of masculine and feminine labor as fundamentally unfair.

The subject, apparently, is broader, deeper, more significant than isolated statistics upon certain hundreds or thousands of

women workers, newly arrived in the masculine fields of general industrialism, and there placed in competition with men.

The question of man *versus* woman is as old as time; the problems of male *versus* female are as delicate as those of flower *versus* plant, and it is only repeating endless confusions to attempt to force upon the individuality of woman the time-worn tests and trials of the energies of man. *Thus far* the average earnings of woman may be less than one dollar a day; but it is a proven truth (which Mrs. Thompson repeats herself) that, thus far at least, a woman can live upon less than a man. The fair conclusion, therefore, accentuates itself—the woman equals the man in ability to preserve life; her needs are less, she accepts less pay. Thus, as an active factor, she justifies her existence in the economic world and upon a purely economic basis. To refuse pay sufficient for her needs only because her stronger companion is unable to sustain himself upon her more modest levels, would be sentimentalism pushed to such extremes as would ruin forever her plea for some place in a purely practical world.

But, says Mrs. Thompson, "the effect of the practice upon economic interests is to lessen efficiency and to increase the cost of production." In the face of assertion I., this claim seems of doubtful force. Is it not undeniably true that the modern employer considers more carefully the physical well-being of his men, as well as of his women employees? Do not factories, stores, etc., where both sexes are employed, open and close at the same hour for all concerned, irrespective of sex? And is not the standard objection to the labor-unions one that rebels against an established rule of consideration for the average man, pushed even to the extent of crippling the possibilities of exceptionally strong individuals? Will it be claimed that *men* are never sick or disabled? If so, why so many beneficiary societies? Why a pension roll? Why a retired list for army and navy? Why the innumerable provisions of railroads, and, increasingly, all corporations, for the help of disabled or temporarily crippled employees, most of whom are male?

That women, as a sex, have more physical endurance, more patience under prolonged pressure than men is too well-known a truth to repeat it again. This plea certainly needs broader horizons than the environment of a sick girl on a couch in a department store.

Women's demand for physical consideration on account of their sex, is all along the line of more humane human living, and the existence of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals as well as to children is no better proof of inferiority in beast or child than the eight-hour law is of male incapacity for a reasonable day's work. If the point is still pressed, in a last analysis, perhaps, the unfortunate fact that drunkenness is largely a masculine failing might even the balance where purely bodily handicaps are concerned.

We do not look upon a man as an object of pity because modern masters have caught the spirit of general progress and are more considerate, more humane than the average employer of mediæval times. Are soldiers illustrations of a "hopeless charity," because modern governments provide camp hospitals, the Red Cross army, and such food and creature comforts as the regiments of the Good Queen Bess or of Frederick the Great never dreamed of receiving? Humanity is not charity, it is justice; and if, indeed, the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor Statistics reports in such fashion that the records show "the tender concern of good men for frail women," it is simply an evidence of a civilized spirit which does credit to the men and is no dishonor to the women.

There is a fatal flaw in all statistics which contrast the male and female forces in the industrial world, or anywhere else, for that matter. No true woman wants to be a man, any more than a virile man wants to be a woman. For all time they are simply—*different;* "male and female created He them," and it is as futile to attempt to equalize them as it would be to make a deer love the ways of a lion, or an eagle content himself with the scope of a wren. Each has a place and that place is final. Statistics, therefore, which aim to prove that newly-arrived woman fails to equal experienced man are no more fair than would be figures which showed the superiority of the trained artisan over the raw apprentice. It is a plain truth that in the world of industry, outside the domestic régime, women are still strangers; they are merely beginners, apprentices; and it is centuries too early to attempt final conclusions as to their industrial acceptability when compared with men.

But, here we approach Mrs. Thompson's third point, "the effect upon the woman herself is to impair her physical fitness for the maternal function, and to subject her to a false system of educa-

tion, which mentally and morally unfits her for her economic office in the family." To the first clause of such a sweeping paragraph every earnest thinker will be moved to pay the closest attention; and if it can be established as an incontrovertible fact that labor impairs woman's "physical fitness for the maternal function," it is one that must "give us pause."

But has not this danger been, at least partly, realized and provided for? In France, we are told, the Council of Salubrity determines "what branches of industry a woman may engage in without detriment to her health."

France, among the modern nations of the world, has an enviable record in regard to her industrial ability. She has a thriftiness, a capacity, a recuperative quality, not easily equalled, and yet we hear continually that "in France, the men are the women and the women are the men."* That is, in France it is a notable fact that the clear-headed, steady-nerved, keen-sighted wife is the economic force which conserves, and also frequently produces, the supplies necessary for the support of the family.

But it is also true, as the quick observer will at once note, that in France the problem of declining maternity is at present a menacing one, and on the surface, the idea that economic success injures motherhood's probabilities might appear to be justified. But M. Zola, who was the great modern materialist, in this especial phase of human living, has declared in many of his books, and most especially in his novel, "*Fécondité*," that, when families in France are restricted in numbers, it is generally due to one of two things. First, the hard-working husband objects to many children as a drain upon his resources; or, second, the ambitious rich couples refuse to raise families, as their chief desire is to leave their estates intact to a single heir, and thus transmit the family name and possessions.

Here, then, we have an array of facts which leaves the woman in industry unassailed, and modern American life sustains the situation. Mrs. Thompson says: "Now, in the design of nature, which neither university courses nor political emancipation can overthrow, the destiny of woman is wifehood, maternity. Abstract these offices from any calculation concerning the sex, and we have the end of the world." The truth of this is readily granted; but we are told also that in the industrial world 17.22 per cent., in-

* Mr. Richard Whiting in "Paris of To-day."

cluding all workers above ten years of age, covers the entire class of feminine industrial factors. There are thus left 82.78 per cent. to sustain the normal order of production; and when we consider the widows, the spinsters, and the deserted wives who are forced upon the field, through no desire of their own for economic independence, the actual number of women insisting upon equal competition within masculine lines grows even ridiculously small.

Noting now that this minute army is "constantly depleted by marriage," and also that "the permanency of woman in industry is as a class and not as an individual," and then admitting that, through her less dominant demands, the woman is able to toil for a lower wage than the man, it still persistently appears, through Mrs. Thompson's own conclusions, that any deterioration in the scale of living which female labor brings about is counterbalanced by the delicacy of woman's constitution, which demands for her comforts and luxuries, all of which are an expense to her employer.

Where maternity is concerned, the admitted truth fully exonerates the average woman in the economic world. It is not the laboring-man's wife, the washerwoman, nor the scrubwoman who fails in fecundity, although these toil daily with all their might, overtaxing repeatedly their poorly nourished physiques; nor is it the mate of the middle-class man, that ideal housewife who justifies the old saw,

> "Man's work is from sun to sun;
> But woman's work is never done."

It is not these (let us insist upon this significant fact); it is not these women who are childless; it is those who rival the lilies of the field. "They toil not, neither do they spin"; but it is they—the rich women, the prosperous ones, the unemployed, the leaders of "social sets," the queens of "social functions," who are more and more insistently refusing to perform the only labor which life has asked of them—the office of reproduction. To the average girl in factory or mill, a home, a husband and a child are still, evidently, such desirable things that she leaves her work and her wage continually, and insists upon "depleting by marriage" her industrial world until she is the despair of the statistician.

In the light of the broadest truth, then, the effect of economic labor is not to be compared in harmful tendencies to the effect of the unused leisure, the petty social ambitions and the soul-be-

numbing selfishness which follow so often in the train of men's acquired millions.

It is not toil, effort, energy, which disintegrates an individual or a nation; it is idleness, inertia, and a desire to allow the willing few to assume the burden of personal support for the many. The spectacle of one hard-pressed male called upon to feed, clothe and decorate half a dozen able-bodied females, "his sisters and his cousins and his aunts," is one the modern world finds degrading to both parties in the uneven contract, and in this remnant of mediæval ethics there is that which smacks of mediæval crudeness.

Again, "the physical fitness for the maternal function" cannot be impaired except through physical degeneration, and careful physicians have shown that among the most trying, enervating and exhausting strains to which the feminine physique can be subjected, perhaps washing, ironing, sweeping and nursing the sick may be counted as in the lead. The trained nurse is an eminently feminine laborer, and yet the testimony in many hospitals is that which declares that it is the exception and not the rule to send out graduates whose physical condition is as good as when they entered upon their training. Statistics claim that, among the insane, farmers' wives often lead in the list; and yet the life of a farmer's wife is dominantly domestic.

But there is still a second clause to be met. "Mentally and morally," the working-woman is unfit for her "economic office in the family." Now why? The writer uses herself as an illustration, and we are therefore excused for becoming personal for a moment. Mrs. Thompson says: "I hire a capable woman to manage my house, and by working at my profession I earn money that compensates my family for the money loss entailed by my domestic inefficiency." Surely, the "capable woman" in the kitchen ordering a household régime and paid by another one, equally capable, at her desk in the library, is a far better situation for any family than a literary woman bungling over range, in linen-closet and dining-room, and a first-class, but not learned, housekeeper vainly hunting work by which to sustain her own possible family.

Why is it a proof of mental or moral inefficiency that a woman earns money in a way which is both pleasant and easy for herself and profitable for others less gifted intellectually?

Was Mrs. Browning of less use to her husband and to the world than she would have been if she had attempted to cook the family meals and sweep the common house? All labor is dignified and uplifting, if properly approached; but all labor is not fitting to each individual.

Shall, then, the woman of active mentality be accused of inefficiency if she lacks only tough physical fibre, or even the practical intelligence that deals knowingly with a domestic régime? It was Mary and not Martha who "chose the better part," according to the greatest of all teachers.

Let it not be said, then, that in a world of men, where even a statistician "never forgets that he is dealing with ladies," the demand upon women recognized in the twentieth century is only for the functions acknowledged by primitive man.

When woman touched man's brain and his soul; when she proved she could sustain fully her maternal functions, and also meet him as companion and friend; then, for the first time in his history, man became altruistic and realized that, within the compass of one home, and with one wife, he could reach a higher grade of civilization than when he ignorantly insisted that motherhood alone should absorb all of a woman's energies.

It is quite true (to return to our direct argument) that "business is business"; but it is also true that the three meals a day, in the humblest household, cannot wait to be served any longer than an editor can wait for copy—yea, not even if the wife is ill or has a baby in her arms. Indeed, the regular demands of average home life, the mere necessities of daily existence, the "what-shall-we-eat, what-shall-we-drink, and wherewithal-shall-we-be-clothed" cry of a wide-awake family, never cease, from the sound of the first call to labor at sunrise until the last stocking is darned, by the mother (at midnight, perhaps), after all the male economic factors in the outside world are soundly asleep in their respective beds.

No one interested in human development, no one concerned in the welfare of our human institutions, cares for a moment to belittle the importance of a woman's presence at home, of a mother's supreme mission, of a wife's significant duties; but let us not confuse our values; let us not assume that—if, indeed, "business is business," and is not yet based upon the Golden Rule—the business world is and forever will be a degener-

ating, debasing atmosphere, and one that necessarily disintegrates a woman's moral and mental fibre where domestic relations are involved. The steady progress of the general world towards broader, gentler, more Christian actualities, in the very heart of the business centres of to-day, shows unmistakably that the basic values of the Golden Rule may in time grow to be appreciated even in the mart of a noisy world.

Business men are not "ravening beasts," that delicate or even sickly women need quake with terror when the stern necessities of life force them into office, store, factory or mill. The intrusive fact that the "servant problem" is the deepest issue in modern domestic economy proves irrefutably that working-women, as a class, have found living conditions more acceptable in the industrial world, outside the home, than they were in household service; and it is lamentably true that the expert cook is by no means a comforting illustration of "sweetness and light."

There are a thousand things within the narrow sphere of a woman's most circumscribed domestic career that may debase her mentality and stifle her soul, until her attitude towards the world at large (and man in particular) is that of Mr. Kipling's "Vampire":

> "And it isn't the blame, and it isn't the shame
> That stings like a redhot brand;
> It's coming to know she never knew why,
> And never could understand."

Life is a larger thing than living; and unless the woman, the mother, the reproductive factor at home, can touch the world of her acting fellow beings outside at some vital point in their development; unless at least 17.22 per cent. in the labor world can feel and see and even suffer through "the cares that infest the day," there will gradually come upon our fertile earth a dismal hour when Western mothers will begin to bring forth only hybrid males—masculine bodies, handicapped by feminine fears; and we shall drift slowly back into the languorous incapacities of Oriental dreams, where sex overshadows all mental and moral values, and the Sultan and the harem illustrate the result of confining woman too closely to her strictly physical function.

But Mrs. Thompson's next point suggests a novel danger. "The effect upon society is to promote pauperdom, both by increasing the expense of living, and by robbing men of the responsibility

which gives them force and success in their natural office of dispenser of wealth to the family."

In the large horizons which attract progressive man towards ever-new fields of effort, towards ever-increasing wants in the way of refined and comfortable existence, surely pauperdom does not increase in proportion to the expense of living. If this were true, the logical conclusion would naturally be that the naked Indian, sheltered in a tent and warmed by his blanket, is a better type of man than the successful citizen of our latest time, who is clad in comfort and elegance, and housed in a dwelling equipped by the eager intelligence of his fellow men, who have combined with him to make physical existence a pleasant and luxurious thing. To increase our needs is surely not to invite pauperdom. The pauper is the man who is content with only the bare necessities of daily living; the prosperous one is he who has a thousand wants, and who actively strives to gratify them. "Men's conduct shapes out their fortunes, and the unlucky are never the valiant nor the wise."

But if, in the money-getting world, about one-sixth of the workers are women, will this fact really "rob men of the responsibility which gives them force and success in their natural office of dispenser of wealth to the family"? Mrs. Thompson says: "It is better even for the family to suffer want than to entail upon the man the degradation of character imposed upon him when he becomes dependent upon a woman's earnings for support." This is a strange claim when woman's endangered maternal function is under discussion. If the alternative must be faced, of a suffering family, of poorly fed and uneducated children, or a husband (an adult) supinely leaning upon her for his creature comforts, what true mother may hesitate for a moment? If she sacrifices the future of her offspring to sustain the feeble manhood of her husband, she is a traitor to her highest duty—the imperative obligation to reproduce not only a quantity, but a quality (in so far as she is able), that will aid in the gradual uplift of mankind at large.

The adult, all statistics show, rarely reforms; the hope of any people under a ban is in the calibre of its children, its coming generations; and if, in truth, there are to be found, here and there, males who are ready to surrender their "natural office as dispenser of wealth to the family," the supine minority is of such

contemptible value, in the general sum of human progress, that the capable females can well afford to leave them behind in the race for success, while they see to it that their children are properly trained to atone, by developed energies, in a new decade, for their fathers' incapacity in this.

And, finally: "In a word the truth about woman in industry is, she is a frightful failure."

If "woman in industry" means an Amazonian virago, clamoring for "woman's rights"; a swaggering hoyden, aping men's modes and manners; or even a too-ambitious worker insisting upon an equal race for power, within purely masculine limits, all honest men, and women, too, will be glad to discover that she has been and still is "a frightful failure." Every time a woman endangers the dignities and responsibilities of her especial sex, she deserves to fail, and Nature will see to it that she does. Every time a woman belittles or scorns the supreme duties of wife and mother, she strikes a telling blow at the progress of the human race, and she deserves the heaviest punishment. Every time a man permits a woman to lose her basic values as a reproductive factor, he makes a grievous mistake, for which his sons, or grandsons, must atone in bitterness and sorrow. Therefore, we quite agree with Mrs. Thompson when she pleads for the conservation of the feminine function, for the preservation of the family and the home.

But the fact that a woman, in the deepest sense, is what Mrs. Browning's Adam calls her, viz., "The Mother of all the living," is only one-half the truth for which she stands. A woman, as well as a man, is a human being, first, last and always; and, as such, each must assume a proper place in such fashion as shall develop the highest possibilities of sentient beings, and at the same time secure the steady advance of humanity as a whole. From this point of view, woman has a dual, or triple, function. "The days of man are threescore years and ten," and from these seven decades a woman may reserve only two, or at most three, for maternity. What shall she do with the remainder of her individuality, after she has fully sustained all the requirements of wifehood and motherhood? She has a mind and a soul, as well as a body, and the needs of her especial nature stamp her, even in babyhood, as equipped with certain talents which it is her first duty to develop.

The past is strewn with innumerable wrecks of maimed and ruined lives, because ignorance and prejudice have insisted upon denying to both boys and girls the right to live out themselves according to their inborn tendencies. "Blessed is the man who has found his work"; so also it is with woman. Part of the truth insists upon the conservation of her distinctive force; but the wider scope demands that one function shall not crush nor overwhelm all others.

When woman tries to become man and to do man's work in man's way, she fails, and she will continue to fail as long as sex is the final distinction which no possible element in life can disturb. But the industrial world does not circle about the home without entering its doors. In the tide of affairs that sweeps men on to fortune, the ebb and flow are felt as quickly upon the hearthstone as they are upon the forum, and the woman beside the cradle is as truly an economic factor, is as significantly "the woman in industry," as any of her sisters who happen to be earning a personal income in more direct ways.

Therefore, when "woman in industry" means, as it already does in numberless ways, simply one class of capable human beings expressing themselves after their own particular fashion; when it shows a Rosa Bonheur with her paint-brushes, a George Eliot with her pen, a Clara Barton with a nurse's cap, a small army busied at loom, at counter, as typewriter, in libraries, in hospitals, in kitchens, or in offices, it means only that here, at last, woman is not only the wife of one man, not only the mother of a half-dozen children; but she is normally "the eternal feminine," manifesting anew her distinctive intelligence, earning in the broadest sense her indestructible honor as "Mother of all the living."

ELIZABETH CARPENTER.

THE RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

BY ROBERT DE C. WARD.

In the April number of the Review, Mr. O. P. Austin answers in the negative the question, "Is the New Immigration Dangerous to the Country?" and arrives at his conclusions by an analysis of numerous statistics, of which he is a well-known and acknowledged master. Mr. Austin says that it is hard "to apply the statistical measuring rod with an assurance of obtaining exact results in the way of conclusions." To this the present writer cordially agrees, for he is convinced that the immigration problem is so vast and so complex that present statistics cannot give any satisfactory solution of it. This problem, however difficult it may be for us to deal with here and now, is essentially a problem not of the present, as most writers assume, but of the future. And because the problem is of the future rather than of to-day, present statistics of immigration, of the character of our immigrants, and of their relation to pauperism and crime, cannot furnish satisfactory answers to questions arising out of this problem. Again, the assimilation of our immigrants cannot possibly be treated by means of statistics alone. Whether our recent immigrants are or are not becoming satisfactorily assimilated can only be determined by those who have constant close personal relations with them.

Thus we are ready to take up the first of the conclusions reached by Mr. Austin, "that the present immigration, large as it is, is not beyond our power of assimilation, and probably of healthful assimilation." The first comment which suggests itself in this connection concerns the numbers, not of last year's immigration, nor of this year's, but of the immigration of 1925, 1950, and of other years still farther off in the future. It is perfectly certain that emigration to this country will not decrease in the

future, except during occasional periods of financial depression, but that it will and must increase, unless the United States take some steps towards further restriction. No one who has watched the trend of passenger-steamship traffic between the United States and European ports within the past few years, and especially within the past year, can have failed to be impressed by the increase in the number of sailings in general, and especially by the marked increase in the number of sailings to and from Mediterranean ports. Within a few months the White Star Line has inaugurated a new service between Mediterranean ports and the United States; the Cunard Line has entered into competition for the steerage traffic from southern Europe, northern Africa and Asia, and has closed a contract with the Austro-Hungarian Government by which the Cunard ships are guaranteed 30,000 emigrants from Austria-Hungary every year;* a new line of steamers has been established between Odessa and New York; the Austro-American steamers which formerly plied as cargo-boats between Trieste and Central America have been transferred to run as passenger-ships between Trieste and New York; the number of Mediterranean sailings of the Hamburg-American, North German Lloyd and other companies, has been largely increased. All this is evidence of a very large growth in the steerage-passenger traffic from southern and eastern Europe and from Asia. The building of new railroads in Asia; the easier communication with the sea thus resulting; the increase in the number of steamship agents all over eastern Europe, northern Africa and Asia Minor—all this likewise means more immigrants.†

Our fathers, who witnessed a total immigration of 128,393 in the decade 1820-1830, would probably have thought it beyond the range of human possibility to have 1,000,000 people brought across the ocean in a year. Yet, in view of the rapid increase in the size of ocean steamships, some of which now accommodate over 2,000 immigrants at once, may we not with reasonable cer-

* That part of the contract which concerns the guarantee of 30,000 emigrants annually has since been modified, according to cabled reports from Europe.

† The competition between the rival steamship lines has recently resulted in a rate-war, and in an accompanying reduction of the cost of a steerage passage from many Europeans ports to the United States to ten dollars, and even less. The natural consequences have been an increase in the number of immigrants, and a marked deterioration in their quality.

tainty expect an annual immigration of 2,000,000 within ten or fifteen years? Do any statistics as to numbers of foreign-born now here help us to solve the immigration problem of the future, which is going to be so immeasurably more difficult? Furthermore, the new immigration from Austria-Hungary, Italy, Russia, Poland, Greece, the Balkan Peninsula, Syria, etc., which has only just begun, will continue to increase with increasing facility of transportation. If we have an Italian slum problem, and a Jewish slum problem now, what shall we have when perhaps 3,000,000 Russian Jews have come to us, and when 5,000,000 Italians are living here? Not only so, immigration from Asia has only just begun. Within a few years it may increase until we have more Asiatic immigrants in a year than we now have Italians. Is this not reasonably certain, and was not the late General Francis A. Walker right when he said that the tide of immigration will flow on as long "as there is any difference of economic level between our own population and that of the most degraded communities abroad"? This, it seems to the writer, is the view of the future which ought to be taken by every one who thinks seriously of this vast problem of immigration. James Bryce was not far wrong when he spoke of the more and more thorough "drainage" of the inland regions of Europe which is illustrated for us in the new immigration, and General Walker's apt phrase, "Pipe-Line Immigration," is as true as it is suggestive; for, although many thousands of immigrants still come here every year who may be ranked with the pioneers who came fifty years ago, when the journey was long, hard and expensive, a very large number now come because they are persuaded to come by some steamship agent; or because they find it easier to leave their home problems and take a fresh start, or indeed because their own communities make it easy for them to leave for the good of those communities. It appears, then, that statistics of present immigration are of little help in a broad view of the immigration problem of the future.

As to the assimilation of our alien population, that, likewise, cannot be expressed statistically. In this matter, there has been no more authoritative expression of opinion, by a large body of competent judges, than is contained in a series of resolutions sent to the last Congress from most of the Boards of Associated Charities throughout the United States. These resolutions, which em-

bodied the views of voluntary and paid charity workers who every day are brought into close contact with the immigrant, and who, if anything, are prejudiced in his favor, held that "it is impossible to make the conditions of the very poor substantially better when every arriving steamer brings more of the ignorant and unskilled to compete for the employments that are open only to the ignorant and unskilled"; and that "the difficulty of securing universal education is greatly increased when every year sees landed an army of one hundred thousand illiterates, whose children will start upon their career as American citizens from ignorant homes, under practically foreign surroundings." It is significant to find in the last Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Boston the following:

> "With an immigration as unrestrained as at present, we can have little hope of permanent gain in the struggle for uplifting the poor of our cities, since newcomers are always at hand, ignorant of American standards."

Again, in the 27th Annual Report of the United Hebrew Charities of New York, after statistics concerning pauperism, is the following:

> "It is unnecessary to introduce . . . the causes that underlie these conditions. The horrible congestion in which so many of our coreligionists live, the squalor and filth, the lack of air and sunlight. . . . Even more pronounced are the results accruing from these conditions: the vice and crime, the irreligiousness, lack of self-restraint, indifference to social conventions, indulgence of the most degraded and perverted appetites, which are daily growing more pronounced and more offensive."

It is clear that we are not properly assimilating our foreign population when a judge in New York State rejects the naturalization papers of sixty persons, on the ground that "when a man has been in this country five years, and is unable to speak our language, . . . he is not fitted to be admitted to citizenship;" or, when we find in the factories of the Empire State young men and women of seventeen to twenty who have lived here since they were four or five and who cannot yet understand or speak English. It must, furthermore, always be remembered that even if all the "unabsorbed" immigrants are brought to the point of demanding the same standards of living as those of the older part of the population, there is, as the late Professor Richmond Mayo-Smith so

clearly pointed out, an inexhaustible supply behind, which in its turn must also be raised up.

Thus, there are two sides to the question, Has the new immigration become assimilated? Whatever may have been our success in assimilating those who have come in the past, it must be remembered that our work thus far is small compared with what is before us. No wonder that General Walker, who had intimate acquaintance with this problem through his work as Superintendent of the United States census, wrote:

> "That man must be a sentimentalist and an optimist beyond all bounds of reason who believes that we can take such a load upon the national stomach without a failure of assimilation, and without great danger to the life and health of the nation."

In connection with assimilation, Mr. Austin makes use of the argument that, "while the immigration is larger now than ever before, it is no larger in proportion to the population than on many former occasions." The difficulty about this argument is that, whereas in the early days of the "new" immigration, twenty years or so ago, the "new" immigrants found themselves merged in a great mass of many millions, consisting almost wholly of Anglo-Saxons, it is becoming increasingly true that our new arrivals from southern and eastern Europe and from Asia come less and less in contact with the older part of our population. What difference does it make to the 200,000 Italians, Hebrews and Poles who were last year destined to New York State, and mostly to New York City, that there is a total population in the country of 80,000,000? The path of an immigrant is very easy from his European village to a settlement of his own countrymen in some American city. He naturally goes where his relatives and friends have already settled; he may live for years in an American community without coming very directly in contact with the older portion of the population, and sometimes even without finding any necessity of learning the English language. Thus it appears that statistics of annual immigration, in its relation to the total population of the country, cannot give any idea of the capacity of our people for the assimilation of the million of immigrants who came last year, nor of the possible future assimilation of the millions who will later come to us.

In regard to Mr. Austin's second conclusion, "that the so-

called 'objectionable class' is not the class which is filling the jails and almshouses," it should be noted that the census statistics of criminality are defective in that they do not make adequate distinction between criminals of foreign birth and of foreign parentage, and that crimes are not properly classified in respect of their being petty or serious. Secondly, it is yet too early to determine statistically what the relation of the new immigration to crime and pauperism will be, there being a good deal of evidence that the children of our recent immigrants are less law-abiding than their foreign-born parents. Thus, in the Final Report of the United States Industrial Commission, page 967, it is stated that "the second generation, *i. e.*, the native children of foreign parents, furnish the largest proportion of commitments and prisoners of all race elements in the population." Thirdly, a good deal of evidence can be adduced to show that the new immigration is a good deal of a financial burden, after all. In New York City there is, of course, the greatest congestion of recent immigrants, and here the rest of the country may well learn a lesson as to the conditions which are pretty certain to prevail elsewhere, as our other cities become more and more filled with the "Pipe-Line" immigrants from the slums of Europe and of Asia. One of the managers of the "House of Refuge" in New York City says:

> "I notice the large number of children that are placed in charitable institutions for no crime or misdemeanor, but to relieve their parents of their support. They are principally from southern and eastern Europe."

There are estimated to be 40,000 cases of trachoma in New York City, imported almost entirely by aliens from southern and eastern Europe, and this danger is so great that the Boards of Education and of Health have found it necessary to examine the pupils in the public schools at frequent intervals, in order to check the spread of this disease among the children. Dr. H. J. Shively says:

> "Infection from trachoma and favus is readily traced to immigrant sources; in tuberculosis the course of the disease is slow and insidious, and immediate sources of infection are less readily recognized. It is perhaps for this reason that the danger of the tuberculous immigrant to the health of the community has not been emphasized as it should be."

When all has been said, *pro* and *con*, it still remains a fact that, whether the new immigration does or does not add *unduly* to the number of criminals and dependents, it certainly adds considerably to them, and finally, that the present gives but little idea of what the future will bring forth. The fact that our newer immigrants have so far not furnished a disproportionately large number of paupers is doubtless in part due to their lower standards of living. But, meanwhile, these same lower standards of living work detrimentally with regard to the community as a whole.

Mr. Austin's third conclusion as to the "new" immigrants is "that, while they are somewhat deficient in the matter of education, that of their children is likely to compare favorably with that of our own population, and that they will thus contribute a safe and valuable element to the future population of the country." This opinion is based on the fact that a larger percentage of the children of immigrants go to school during the years between five and fourteen than of the children of native whites, and that the percentage of illiterates among children born in the United States of foreign parents is smaller than among the children of native whites. These facts are well known, and are among the most hopeful and most encouraging signs for the future. On the other hand, however, ought we to make our already heavy burden of native illiteracy any heavier by adding to it several hundred thousand foreign illiterates, for the reason, forsooth, that the children of these foreign illiterates will form "a safe and valuable element" in the population? We have the burden of native illiteracy, adult and child; we have the burden of negro education. Our first duty is, obviously, to our own people. Shall we deliberately add to these burdens the education of the illiterate millions who are coming and will continue to come from foreign lands? Miss Adele Marie Shaw, who has recently made a thorough study of the New York City public schools, concludes that the only remedies for the conditions there existing are the restriction of foreign immigration and a vast increase in expenditure—"larger than any yet dreamed of." "With eighty-five per cent. of its population foreign or of foreign parentage, its salvation dependent upon the conversion of a daily arriving cityful of Russians, Turks, Austro-Hungarians, Sicilians, Greeks, Arabs, into good Americans . . . the city has a problem of popular education that is staggering." Furthermore, it is to be remembered that

the very statistics which show the small illiteracy of the children of foreign-born immigrants also show a high percentage of criminality of these same children when they grow up.

Fourthly, regarding the relation of the newer immigrants of the "objectionable class" to politics, it is claimed by Mr. Austin "that they are not, as a class, as dangerous an element in politics as has been frequently asserted." To confirm this view, statistics are given to show that the recent immigrants from southern and eastern Europe have not, as a whole, become naturalized to any great extent, and hence do not exert a bad political influence, because they do not vote. This is a curious argument, from an American point of view: that there is no objection to having a large number of immigrants of certain races in our population as long as these people do not vote. Can that be a very desirable class of immigrants which we are anxious to have remain outside the body politic? The fact that many electoral votes against free silver in 1896 came from States having a large number of foreign-born voters is not an argument against the further restriction of the immigration of races least closely allied to us, for these foreign-born voters were almost altogether from northern and western Europe, the others, as Mr. Austin himself points out, not generally being naturalized.

Mr. Austin's last conclusion is "that they are an important factor in the development and wealth-producing power of the country," and this conclusion he supports by means of statistics showing that in the States having a large proportion of foreigners there has been a very great production of wealth. No one can, or would, deny the fact that recent immigrants have contributed to the wealth of the country, but to argue from bare statistics that, because these States have witnessed a very large production of wealth, therefore the "new" immigration should be allowed to continue practically as at present, is rather illogical. Cheap labor is usually considered by the capitalist to be an advantage, and large employers of labor have always used their influence in Congress to ward off impending immigration legislation. But, as Mr. Edward T. Devine, Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of New York, has recently well said:

"While it is true that cheap labor may be profitable from the employer's point of view, it does not follow that those who are considering the interests of the community as a whole can look with favor upon

it. . . . The effect of utilizing underpaid immigrant labor under conditions which, in order to afford a living at all, make excessive demands upon adult men, and lead irresistibly to the employment of women and children, is directly to increase the number who sooner or later require relief. . . . The plain tendency is to augment the number of those who break down prematurely; of those who in advanced years have made no provision for their own maintenance; of the children whose support must be supplied by others than their own parents, and of those who, meeting with unexpected misfortunes of any kind, have no resources except the generosity of strangers."

In other words, labor which is economically "cheap" is not socially "cheap." Concerning the character of much of our present immigration we have the testimony of the Commissioner of Immigration at New York, one of the most efficient, capable and honest officers who have ever been in the Government service, who holds that "capital cannot, and would not if it could, employ much of the alien material that annually passes through Ellis Island." These people "are neither physically nor mentally fitted to go to the undeveloped parts of our country."

"At least 200,000 (and probably more) aliens came in (last year) who, although they may be able to earn a living, yet are not wanted, will be of no benefit to the country, and will, on the contrary, be a detriment, because their presence will tend to lower our standards; and if these 200,000 persons could have been induced to stay at home, nobody, not even those clamoring for more labor, would have missed them. Their coming has been of benefit chiefly, if not only, to the transportation companies which brought them here."

The writer is not a believer in the total prohibition of immigration, nor even in a large measure of restriction; he realizes that good immigration always has been and always will be an advantage to this country; he does not for a moment wish to appear as opposing Italian immigration, or Jewish immigration, or Hungarian immigration as a whole; he has come into too close contact with many of our newer immigrants to have failed to see the many excellent qualities which distinguish large numbers of these people. He merely wishes to present, for the consideration of the readers of the REVIEW, the other side of the conclusions which Mr. Austin has reached. He feels that any one who makes a thorough study of the whole immigration problem,—not of a few alien families in one city only—without the prejudice of mere sentiment or of selfish and pecuniary interests, and who looks to the future

rather than at the present, must reach the conclusion that some reduction in the volume of immigration is necessary, if American standards of living, and American ideals generally, are to be maintained for all time. This reduction may be accomplished by means of a law limiting the number of immigrants from different countries who shall come here each year, as has been suggested by Congressman Robert Adams, Jr., of Pennsylvania; or, less arbitrarily, by means of the illiteracy test, which has the support of President Roosevelt, of the Commissioner of Immigration, and of a large majority of those who have given the subject serious thought. This test is in line with our ideas of universal education; will enormously stimulate the demand for popular education in Europe; will reduce the number of immigrants to a volume which there is some possibility of our being able to assimilate; will, with reasonable exceptions to prevent the separation of families, admit those only who, possessing the rudiments of an education, will certainly have a valuable asset in the struggle for existence.

After all, the fundamental question which underlies everything else in this immigration problem has not even been alluded to in Mr. Austin's article. No statistical study of immigration can ever be complete because there is one element, more important than all the others, concerning which no statistics can ever be compiled. That element is the number of American children who, because of the pressure of foreign immigration, *have never been born.* Back of all statistics of the criminality, pauperism, assimilation, illiteracy, naturalization and economic value of immigrants, lies the great question of the effect of immigration upon our native, or older, stock. No discussion of this question can be at all complete which leaves this out of consideration. The immigration of the last fifty years has contributed millions to our population; has undoubtedly added enormously to the wealth of the country, but these things have been accomplished at the expense of the native stock. The decreasing birth-rate of our native population, the complex resultant, without doubt, of many factors, has been very largely due to the effect of foreign immigration. The late General Walker first advanced this view; that, as newer and lower classes of immigrants came to this country, Americans shrank more and more from the industrial competition which was thus forced upon them; they became unwilling to subject their

sons and daughters to this competition, and *hence these sons and daughters were never born.* The stronger the competition, the greater the effort to maintain and raise the standard of living and the social position above that of the majority of recent immigrants; and the greater this effort, the greater the voluntary check to population. This competition is most serious in its consequences when it is due to the immigration of races which are able and content to live under wholly inferior conditions, and when this immigration continually feeds the lower strata of the population, however rapidly the intermediate strata may be raised in their standards of living. The question is a race question, pure and simple. Many of our recent immigrants, not discouraged by the problem of maintaining high standards of living with their many children, are replacing native Americans. It is fundamentally a question as to what kind of babies shall be born; it is a question as to what races shall dominate in this country. The American birth-rate is decreasing. Mr. R. R. Kuczynski, after a very careful study of the population statistics of Massachusetts, concludes that the native population is dying out. General Walker believed that foreign immigration into this country has, from the time it assumed large proportions, not reinforced our population, but replaced it. The United States Industrial Commission, which made one of the most thorough studies of immigration ever undertaken, says in its Final Report that "it is a hasty assumption which holds that immigration during the nineteenth century has increased the total population." In his new book, "The Slav Invasion and the Mine Workers," Dr. P. J. Warne says that the coming of the Slavs into the mining districts of Pennsylvania since 1880 has determined the number of births in the older, English-speaking portion of the population. More recently still, Mr. Henry Gannett, well known for his statistical work in connection with the Census, in a hitherto unpublished statement, says:

"I do not think that our population has been materially, if at all, increased by immigration. On the contrary, I think that our population would be almost, if not quite, as numerous if the great flood of immigration which began in 1847 had never reached our shores."

Mr. Gannett believes that the mixture of our blood with that of Germany, Ireland and Scandinavia has been an advantage, but he

also believes that a mixture with the blood of the "new" immigration "can have only a bad effect." Finally, in a recent article, Mr. Robert Hunter, of the University Settlement in New York, puts the case very clearly as follows:

"The fathers and mothers of the American children can be chosen, and it is in the power of Congress to decide upon what merits. . . . No nation has ever had a social responsibility of greater magnitude. The future of American society, industry, religious faith, political institutions, may be decided in a way quite marvellous by the governing powers of this country. The worst aspect of the whole matter is that the selfish forces interested in promoting immigration in every conceivable way, are deciding all these questions for us. The ones who come and the numbers who come depend largely upon the steamship companies. Whether we have more Hungarians than Italians, or Syrians than Greeks, or Scandinavians than Slavs, depends to a very large extent upon their ports, their passage rates and their success in advertising and soliciting. . . . I believe that this country may be ruined by leaving the volume and quality of immigration almost entirely to the decision of the steamship companies. . . . The skill of their agents decides whether we shall have one race or another come in great masses to our shores. . . . If we let the steamship companies and the railroads, wanting cheap labor, alone, we shall not decide what immigrants will be better for coming, and what ones the country needs. They will decide it for us. . . . Our governing bodies . . . in the past . . . have failed to consider the welfare of the people, either immigrants or Americans. The decision has been made as a result of pressure brought to bear upon public officials by private and selfish interests. Our national characteristics may be changed; our love of freedom, our religion, our inventive faculties, our standard of life. All of the things, in fact, for which America has been more or less distinctive among the nations, may be entirely altered. Our race may be supplanted by another, by an Asiatic one, for instance, and not because it is better so, nor because it is for the world's good. On the contrary, it is in order that individuals interested in steamships may be benefited, and in order that employers may have cheaper labor. These selfish forces may be disguised, but they are there."

ROBERT DEC. WARD.

BRITISH SHIPPING AND THE STATE.

BY BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

THE relations of the State to Shipping have been brought into the forefront of public discussion in Great Britain by the contracts between the Government and the Cunard Company, and the Morgan Shipping Combine; and in the United States by the revival of the proposal for a system either of State subsidies or of preferential duties on goods imported in American bottoms. In the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for October, 1903, Mr. E. T. Chamberlain, United States Commissioner of Navigation, refers to the two agreements with the Cunard Company and the International Mercantile Marine Company, as "two masterpieces of British business-statesmanship." They are not so regarded in Great Britain, but rather as examples of legislation in a panic. Mr. Chamberlain is perfectly right in saying that the contract with the Cunard Company may be regarded as the sequence of the Morgan merger. But he is surely wrong in thinking that "the new Cunard contract will undoubtedly convince many Americans that again we ought to give up the ocean steamship business and devote ourselves to farming and the manufacture of sewing-machines, tin-plates and other industries for which we have a natural or acquired aptitude." The more likely is it that the contract will "convince another considerable portion of the American public that more than ever the United States should make a respectable showing on salt water."

But the contracts between the British Government and the Cunard Company and the Morgan Company, will have no effect either on the maritime supremacy of Great Britain or in retarding the maritime development of America. As the present writer has already pointed out in the pages of this REVIEW it is not with subsidized liners that British supremacy lies, but with the indus-

trious and legislatively-snubbed cargo "tramps," who perform eighty per cent. of the world's carrying-trade. And as to the International Mercantile Marine Company, the writer may be permitted to recall what he said on that occasion:

> "As a deal the Morgan merger neither increases the mercantile marine of America nor diminishes that of Britain. It may or may not be a good speculation, but that is another question. It does not affect either British ship-owners or British ship-builders, who are as ready to own and to build vessels to suit the conditions of the times as they always have been and always will be."

It is still the case, and I hope it always will be, that the ship-owners of Great Britain do not ask for bounties or doles. They want less, not more, of State interference in the management of their business, and they do not want State funds at all for the promotion of that business. They laugh at the idea that subsidies have, or have had any effect whatever in placing them at the top of the world's sea-carriers. But, while this is so, the fact remains that the State has duties to its shipping which cannot be neglected, in the case of a maritime country like Britain, without serious national danger. It is not enough for a State to create a Maritime Department in its Ministry of Trade and Commerce to tyrannize over ship-owners, and to lay obligations on its own shipping which cannot be enforced on the shipping of other nations. It is not enough to strike an arbitrary load-line, to order the employment of specific life-saving appliances, to lay down strict regulations for the maintenance and treatment of the crews, etc. The Departmental mistake is made of regarding the espionage of ships as equivalent to the national care of shipping. It is not. The old Navigation Laws of Great Britain were too easily abandoned in 1849, without sufficient thought of the future. When we repealed these laws, we threw open our whole coasting-trade and our whole inter-Imperial sea-carrying trade to the ships of all nations, whether these nations admitted our ships to their own corresponding trades or not. It is scarcely necessary to ask American readers if that was wise. It is not here contended that the Navigation Laws were just and desirable as they stood. They had grown with the centuries, and had become encrusted with age. But, such as they were, they were a weapon in our hands for the cultivation of reciprocal relations with other maritime

countries. We threw away that weapon, and America sailed into our Colonial trade with those magnificent old-time clippers that it took us such a long while to beat. America did not reciprocate, and, down to the eve of the Civil War, was very nearly our equal in maritime efficiency. But for that war, and the subsequent evolution of the iron ship, we might have only occupied second place for many a year, if not for all time. As it happened, after the abrogation of the Navigation Laws a succession of incidents gave an impetus to our merchant shipping that has been erroneously supposed to be entirely the effect of the repeal of these laws.

The Bill for the repeal of the Navigation Laws was passed on June 25th, 1849, and the coasting-trade of the United Kingdom was in 1854 unconditionally thrown open to the vessels of all nations. The historian of merchant shipping, W. S. Lindsay, thus notes the event:

"The actual repeal of the Navigation Laws having in the summer of 1849 become an accomplished fact, the consternation among all classes connected with British shipping was almost universal, mingled with feelings of curiosity and doubt as to the course which the Americans would now adopt. These doubts, however, were soon removed by a prompt notification of the Government of the United States, issued on the 15th October, 1849, honestly and boldly putting the law of 1828 in motion, but *retaining the coasting trade of that country in all its integrity;* and to this day they decline, on alleged constitutional grounds, to consider the voyage from New York to California as in any respect different from the voyage between New York and Baltimore, or in any way resembling the trade between London and the Cape of Good Hope or Australia, though in both cases alike the voyage can only be made by passing the coasts of foreign nations."

Lindsay wrote thus in 1876, and to the present day America makes the same reservation, with the addition of the trade between the ports of the United States and her oversea territories in Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. The Philippines are meanwhile open, because, under the Hispano-American Treaty of Peace, Spanish vessels have the same rights as American vessels in Philippine ports until 1909, and assurance has been given that British shipping will not be less favorably treated than Spanish. But, after 1909, the trade between the United States and the Philippines will, doubtless, be reserved to the vessels of the Federal Union. So wide an extension of the term "coastal

trade" may not be more extravagant than the reservation of the trade round the coasts of two continents and through the waters of a dozen foreign Powers, but it more directly challenges comparison with such British-Imperial trade as that between say, Montreal and Cape Town, which Britain leaves American vessels at perfect liberty to engage in. It is true that American vessels take no part in the coasting-trade of the United Kingdom, though it is open to them; but America has now become an extra-continental nation and aims at becoming a great Maritime Power.

It was not the repeal of the Navigation Laws that gave Great Britain the lead; but, with the spring of 1852, as Lindsay reminds us, brighter days dawned for the British ship-owner. He could then obtain a moderate remuneration on his capital, and there was even an actual scarcity of tonnage by 1854. Freights rose; we had hesitated to increase the number of our ships, whilst foreigners, with the exception of the Americans, had refrained from rushing largely into the trade we had opened for them. So it came to pass there was hardly tonnage enough to meet the increasing requirements of commerce, still less to satisfy the sudden demand which arose, in 1854, on the outbreak of the Crimean War; vessels could not then be found in sufficient numbers for the transport and supply purposes of the allied armies, nor was there a sufficient supply of British seamen to man our war-ships. It was at that time Government threw open our coasting-trade and repealed the once famous manning clause, which, however, "neither increased on the average the number of foreigners we had hitherto been allowed to employ in our ships, nor deteriorated the number and quality of British seamen, though aiding at the time the more expeditious equipment of our fleets." New trades were opened up by the discovery of gold in California and in Australia. A great tide of emigration began to flow from Europe to America, and again to the South Seas. America lost her share in these trades by the Civil War, and was prevented by her own Navigation Laws from recovering it. Then the change from wood to iron, before she became an iron producer, threw her out of the race as a ship-builder.

With regard to the duties of the State, let us recall what Adam Smith wrote:

"There seem to be two cases in which it will be advantageous to lay some burden upon foreign for the encouragement of domestic industry.

The first is, when some particular sort of industry is necessary for the defence of the country. The defence of Great Britain, for example, depends very much upon the number of its sailors and shipping. The Act of Navigation, therefore, very properly endeavors to give the sailors and shipping of Great Britain the monopoly of the trade of their own country, in some cases by absolute prohibition and in others by heavy burdens upon the shipping of other countries."

Adam Smith contended that, as defence was of more importance than opulence, the Navigation Act was one of the wisest of all the commercial regulations of the country.

Said Mr. E. T. Chamberlain in this REVIEW:

"American acquisition of the control of four of the largest, most modern, most profitable and best equipped British lines of transatlantic steamers, the White Star, Atlantic Transport, Leyland, and Dominion lines, owning over 100 steamers aggregating 900,000 tons gross register, was politically more important, both to the United States and to the United Kingdom, than it was economically. It was regarded with concern by sober-minded Britons, not so much for itself, when all the facts became known, as for what it seemed to foretell. It indicated that accumulated American wealth was beginning to seek outlet for investment on the sea, that it was following the line on which it would encounter the least resistance from governmental regulation or national sentiment, and that this line led into the bulwarks of Great Britain's political and commercial strength, her mercantile marine."

Well, those sober-minded Britons who were concerned at the Morgan merger have become rather ashamed at the unnecessary feeling they displayed. The merger is more likely to dissipate than add to the accumulation of American wealth, and it is not in any degree (so far as one can judge) inciting other Americans to put their accumulated wealth into shipping. But, as a matter of fact, they were not all British lines or British vessels that were acquired by the International Mercantile Marine Company. With the exception of the White Star line, they were practically all American vessels, though sailed under the British and Belgian flags. The political importance of the merger has been in recalling to the attention of the people of Great Britain the duties they owe to the maritime industry, upon which their national prosperity depends.

Is it one of these duties to allow an alien Corporation to use the shelter of the British flag under which to compete with British shipping? Commissioner Chamberlain has written: "the build-

ing of steamers at home (*i. e.,* in the United States) was impracticable, because they cost more here for several reasons than when built abroad, and once built it costs more to maintain and operate them." But there is nothing in the composition of the Morgan merger which can be supposed to be an influence towards the resuscitation of American shipping.

The present writer was never one of those who regarded this combination with alarm, or who objected to American capitalists buying as many British vessels as they have a mind to and the cash for. What he did and does object to is, that under the shelter of the Companies Act, the principles and policy of the Merchant Shipping Act are set aside. The country has decreed that no vessel shall be entitled to such privileges as belong to a British vessel, to the British register and to the British flag, unless wholly owned by British subjects, natural born or naturalized. It has also decreed that no Corporations shall be the registered owners of British ships, unless "established under and subject to the laws of some parts of His Majesty's dominions, and having their principal place of business in those dominions." Such are the regulations which the British State has made for the ownership of British vessels. But it has made no regulation for the ownership of the shares in a British Company, registered as the owner of a British vessel. Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan cannot as an individual own the "Celtic" and the other White Star boats under the British flag, but he can own a Company which acquires 742 of the 750 shares of the Company registered as the owner of these vessels. Would America allow her Navigation Laws to be thus travestied?

Now, as to the agreement of August last between the British Government and the International Mercantile Marine Association, which Commissioner Chamberlain regards as a declaration of British maritime policy against the extension of American influence in the ocean-carrying trade, it is to the following effect:

"(1) The British companies included in the Association shall, so long as the stipulations on their part and on the part of the American company hereinafter contained are duly observed, continue to be treated as heretofore on the same footing of general equality with other British companies in respect of any services—naval, military, or postal—which His Majesty's Government may desire to have rendered by the British Mercantile Marine, provided that nothing in this agreement contained shall extend to vessels of uncommercial speed which His Majesty's Gov-

ernment may specially require to be constructed, and which are primarily designed for service in time of war. And these presents also witness that in consideration of the undertaking hereinbefore contained on the part of the parties hereto of the first part, the American company and the British companies included in the Association hereby agree as follows: (2) The British companies included in the Association shall be, and continue to be, British companies qualified to own British ships, and a majority at least of their directors shall be British subjects. (3) No British ship in the Association, nor any ship which may hereafter be built or otherwise acquired for any British company included in the Association, shall be transferred to a foreign registry (without the written consent of the President of the Board of Trade, which shall not be unreasonably withheld), nor be nor remain upon a foreign registry. Nothing shall be otherwise done whereby any such ship would lose its British registry or its right to fly the British flag. (4) British ships in the Association, and ships that may hereafter be built or otherwise acquired for any British company included in the Association, shall be officered by British subjects; and, as regards their crews, shall carry the same proportional number of British sailors of all classes as His Majesty's Government may prescribe or arrange for in the case of any other British line engaged in the same trade. (5) Subject to the existing agreement between the Admiralty and the Oceanic Steam Navigation Company (Limited), and without prejudice to the provisions therein contained, the American company and any British company included in the Association shall sell or let on hire at any time during the continuance of this agreement to the Admiralty, when required so to do by the Admiralty, any British ship in the Association, and any ship hereafter to be built or otherwise acquired for any British company included in the Association, which the Admiralty may from time to time select. The terms of purchase or hire, if not otherwise agreed on, shall be similar to those contained in the existing agreement aforesaid."

This reads bravely, but it is in point of fact valueless. The so-called British companies are actually American in ownership and control, and their ships are not "British ships" in the true sense of the word. This agreement just legalizes a breach of the Merchant Shipping Act, and it is no advantage to British shipping that it forbids the transfer of any of the Combine's vessels now under the British flag to any foreign registry without the consent of the British Government. Mr. Morgan cannot, if he would, transfer these vessels to the American registry, and there is no registry he could find to be preferred to the British. As to the privilege to "sell, let or hire" to the Admiralty if and when required, why the Admiralty has always the privilege to buy or charter any vessels it may want at any time, without any pre-

paratory contracts or Acts of Parliament. This contract for twenty years with the Morgan Combine is not worth to the British Government the paper on which it is written, and the value of it to the Morgan Combine may be inferred from the fact that the Admiralty subventions which the White Star boats at present receive as "merchant cruisers" will terminate in another year or so. When the Combine was formed and the contract was negotiated, it was not known that the British Government intended to abandon the system of subsidizing merchant steamers for future possible war service, a system upon which many fallacious arguments have been based by American writers.

The contract between the British Government and the International Mercantile Marine Company is not regarded with any favor in British shipping circles, and it is merely accepted in political circles as the unnecessary consequence of the irrational spasm caused by the formation of the Morgan Combine. It is not to be overlooked that the American-owned vessels in this combination are thus officially licensed by the British Government to enter into competition with British vessels in the British and British-Colonial coasting-trade. By the Admiralty subvention, they positively receive the assistance of British State money in order to compete with British private shipping. And surely that is not a reasonable situation in the relations between Shipping and the State.

It is otherwise with the contract between the Government and the Cunard Company, which may or may not have been necessary in the circumstances, and which may or may not be an advantageous one to the Company, but which is certainly justifiable on national grounds. In the opinion of those who are charged with the administration of the affairs of Great Britain, and who have to watch over and safeguard its far-reaching Imperial interests, it is necessary to have at the call of the Government merchant steamers of a certain efficiency, capable of outsailing any other merchant steamers afloat. A Committee of Inquiry has, after thorough examination, declared that such vessels cannot be constructed and maintained in the desired state of efficiency at a commercial profit. The Government have, therefore, concluded with the Cunard Company a working agreement, or to some extent a partnership in which one partner (the Government) advances the capital but does not share in either the profits or the

losses. The British Government acquires a control over all the steamships of the Cunard Company running between Liverpool and New York, Boston, the Mediterranean ports, and Havre. The company undertake to build two additional vessels for their Liverpool and New York service. These two steamships will be of the largest size, and are to have a speed of from 24 to 25 knots per hour. They are, along with the company's other vessels, to be at the disposal of the Admiralty for hire or purchase, but in normal times they are to be used for rapid mail-service and for passenger-traffic. The company's lines are to be maintained under the British flag and British management, with no undue increase in the freights or charges for the carriage of goods, and no undue preference as against British subjects. The masters, officers and engineers in charge of the vessel are always to be British subjects, and at least three-fourths of the crew must be British subjects. All certificated officers other than engineers, and not less than half the crews, must belong to the Royal Naval Reserve or the Royal Naval Fleet Reserve. The company are not to sell any of their vessels of the speed of 17 knots or upwards without the consent of the Government. The monetary consideration for these concessions includes a payment by the Government to the company of £150,000 a year. In addition to this annual subsidy the Government are to lend to the Company a sum not exceeding £2,600,000 at 2¾ per cent., to pay for the construction of the two new vessels. This loan, which is to be repaid by the company in twenty annual instalments, ranks as a first charge upon the whole of the Cunard fleet, and will be secured by Debentures. The present Cunard fleet consists of 17 vessels, with a total tonnage of 110,782 tons and a value of close upon £2,000,000, sterling. The trustees for the Debenture-holders are Sir Francis Hopwood, permanent Secretary of the Board of Trade, on behalf of the Government; Lord Inverclyde, for the Cunard Company; and Lord Revelstoke, who is elected by his two colleagues. The company are also to issue to two nominees of the Government such voting power as will prevent the passing of any special resolution by the shareholders in violation of the terms of the present agreement. The Cunard Company undertake to give a weekly American mail-service by its fastest vessels, for which the postal subsidy at present payable to them will be increased to £68,000 a year.

The condition as to the Government's share in the Company is thus worded:

"The company shall, as soon as the articles of association of the company shall have been altered as aforesaid, issue to two nominees of His Majesty's Government one £20 share of the company, carrying the same voting power and other rights and privileges as an ordinary £20 share of the company, but for the purpose of demanding a poll in respect of and voting against any special resolution involving any alteration of the company's articles of association, so far as respects the provisions referred to in clause 2 hereof and the second schedule hereto; also carrying the following additional rights and privileges, that is to say (*a*) the right to demand a poll upon the occasion of any such special resolution as aforesaid; and (*b*) the right to give against any such special resolution, as aforesaid, additional votes equal in number to one-fourth of the number of votes possessed by the company's share, stock or debenture holders for the time being."

There is no mystery about this. It is all quite plain and above board. It was perfectly proper in the circumstances, and after the Morgan merger, to make the conditions about British ownership, management and manning. The subvention may or may not be sufficient to pay the interest on the money loaned. But that is not the object of it, and the vessels may be worked at a dead loss over and above the subsidy. The amount to be paid annually by the Government for the call of the two ships and their colleagues in the fleet is just what the Admiralty Committee on Merchant Cruisers reported would be necessary to remunerate only *one* vessel of the size and speed of these new Cunarders.

When the Cunard contract was before Parliament it was quite successfully maintained that there was no inconsistency between abandoning the old policy of subsidies as announced and adopting this particular new one. The new policy was adopted to meet a new and special need. It was admitted that the Cunard agreement had a direct connection with the Morgan Combine. If the Government had not stepped in, it was urged, the Cunard Company might have been forced into the American Association. But the American Association had nothing to do with the necessity of having some fast merchant cruisers available for the needs of the navy. The Admiralty found that there were in existence at least two — and there were being built two more — steamers which, from their speed and the enormous amount of coal which they could carry, could not possibly be caught by any cruiser in

the British navy. The Admiralty were unanimously of opinion that a remedy must be found. It was just then that the Morgan Combination was made public, and the Admiralty determined to take action on the cheapest method that could be adopted. Shipowners do not think that the Cunard Company has got more than a fair bargain, and certainly neither the Cunard nor any other company would, for commercial reasons, have dreamed of building such ships as the two now arranged for. Indeed, so astute a critic of Admiralty affairs as Sir William Allan has frankly expressed the opinion that the Government has got the best of the bargain. The simple justification for the agreement is that very swift steamers are needed for British maritime interests, and that very swift steamers do not pay. By means of this subvention the Admiralty will obtain all the services that the desiderated cruisers will provide at (they contend) less cost than by building for naval purposes only. The whole of what the Admiralty want cannot be obtained commercially, but nine-tenths of it are by this agreement obtained commercially and the other tenth is provided by the nation as a military contribution. This is the simple essence of the arrangement. But it will not increase the maritime trade of Great Britain: it may land both the Company and the Government in eventual loss: and, while quite in harmony with the Merchant Shipping laws, it is opposed to the principle of the other agreement between the British Government and the Morgan Combine.

What I wish to make clear is, that this subvention under the new contract with the Cunard Company is in no sense a shipping subsidy such as France has, and as some Americans desire for the encouragement and sustenance of a mercantile marine. The Cunard agreement is a legitimate national undertaking, which may or may not have large national issues, but not in the way of the development of shipping.

The objection of the "tramp" owner to subsidies is often quoted, but as a matter of fact he does not need them, because with cheap ships and cheaper handling he can beat the American, his only possible rival. The German has more profitable fields of employment away from the Atlantic. But for the Morgan Combine there would have been no Cunard subsidy, nor perhaps an Admiralty inquiry into the question of merchant cruisers. The process which culminated in the Morgan Company was not

so sudden as has been supposed. When the purchase of the Leyland Line was completed by Mr. Morgan, there were no fewer than 136 American-owned steamers, of 672,455 tons gross, sailing under foreign flags. Mr. Gage said, when the Frye-Hanna Subsidy Bill was in evidence, that "the problem of improved transportation facilities to foreign markets is of greater importance to the inland-producing States of the Union than to the seaboard commercial cities." The rapid expansion of the foreign trade of America helped to give the great railroads of America a commanding position on the Atlantic. A steamship-line or two, if it promotes the efficiency of these systems, is part of their economy. The reason of such large registration of American shipping under foreign flags is, no doubt, because the proceeding pays. The cause is that the cost of substituting for the present "Combine" fleet American-built and American-manned vessels would be a halfpenny per gross ton per 100 nautical miles. The basis of this estimate is to be found in the returns of the Bureau of Shipping at Washington. The American ship-builder probably hates the idea of "free ships," as much as does the Steel Trust and the existing shipping companies. The shipping problem for Britain, however, is not on the Atlantic alone, but on those other and broader seas which separate the wide-spread branches of the British Empire.

In a Cobden Club leaflet on Shipping Subsidies, Sir Spencer Walpole says:

"It is, perhaps, a consciousness of the hopeless nature of the policy of subsidies that is inducing the Protectionists to suggest another and more drastic remedy. They wish to confine trade between British ports—the coasting-trade, as they are pleased to term it—to British bottoms. They seem to forget that there are two interests vitally concerned in the matter: (1) the shipping interest, naturally in favor of dear freights: (2) the manufacturing interest, equally naturally desiring cheap freights. The manufacturing interest secures its object by the existence of competition. The shipping interest would have the manufacturers at their mercy if competition was withdrawn. Men in India, for example, already complain that a great line of steamers has secured too much of a monopoly of the Eastern trade. How greatly would those complaints increase if the Peninsular and Oriental Company was no longer subject to the competition of the French Messageries and the North German Lloyd, by foreign vessels being prohibited from trading with British goods to British ports! There is a still more decisive objection, moreover, to the proposal. The interest of this country is obviously

founded on the policy of the open door. And men of all parties are virtually agreed that Lord Salisbury was right in urging that the relations of Europe with the East should be based on this arrangement. It is manifest, however, that we cannot have two different things at the same time. We cannot have the policy of the open door in China, and of the closed door throughout the British Empire. We must choose between the one and the other. Can any reasonable person doubt on which side our choice must lie?"

Here, however, are numerous fallacies. The coasting-trade—"as they are pleased to call it"—concerns much more than the rival interests of ship-owners and manufacturers. The reservation of the coasting-trade by America, Russia and (to some extent) France, is in point of fact a large and liberal subsidy to the merchant shipping of each of these countries. It is perfectly right that each country should reserve its own trade for its own ships if it thinks proper; and it is perfectly true that few foreign vessels engage in the coasting-trade of the United Kingdom. But it is not right that any country which reserves its own coastal trade should have at command the coastal trade of other countries: and the real coastal trade of the British Empire is that between all its widely separated members.

At the 1902 Conference of Colonial Premiers in London the following resolution on the coasting-trade was proposed by the Government of New Zealand:

"That in view of the application of the coasting laws of the United States, and of other nations, the time has arrived for negotiations to be opened with a view to removal or modification of restrictions on British trade, failing which the Imperial Government should take steps to protect the trade of the Empire by passing a law declaring that the Colonies and Dependencies shall come within similar coasting laws."

The matter was fully considered by the Conference, especially in regard to its bearing on our Treaties of Commerce and Navigation with certain foreign countries, and the decision of the Conference was expressed in the following resolution:

"That it is desirable that the attention of the Governments of the Colonies and the United Kingdom should be called to the present state of the navigation laws in the Empire and in other countries, and to the advisability of refusing the privileges of coastwise trade, including trade between the Mother Country and its Colonies and Possessions, and between one Colony or Possession and another, to countries in which the

corresponding trade is confined to ships of their own nationality, and also to the laws affecting shipping with a view of seeing whether any other steps should be taken to promote Imperial trade in British vessels."

There is now in Great Britain a gathering force of public opinion in favor of making the terms of these resolutions effective.

The point which is coming up for deliberation and decision with regard to the relations of the British State to its shipping, then, is not whether or not we shall subsidize, but how we shall bring about fair dealing by neutralizing the subsidies of other nations. Our ship-owners do not want bounties; they want fair play. And that they do not get, even from their own government. They want to be relieved of the disabilities from which foreign ship-owners are free, and they desire that all shipping entering British ports shall submit to the same regulations as British vessels are subject to. And this the State can do by legislation, and by negotiation with other Maritime Powers. As to direct bounties given by foreign nations, there are two ways in which they may be dealt with—by excluding subsidized vessels altogether from British ports, or by imposing a duty equal to the subsidies they receive, on the principle of the countervailing duties on sugar. But that would not get rid of the great indirect bounties granted by those nations which reserve their own coastal trades while coming, or having the free way to come, with all their maritime force into the British coastal trade. And the coast-line of the British Empire is the largest in the world. Is it not the duty of the British State to close it to all who will not in turn admit British ships to their coastal trades?

BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

THE DARK ROSALEEN.

BY HENRY W. NEVINSON.

THERE is in Ireland an intention of putting up a memorial to Clarence Mangan, if only money enough can be collected. Whether, in the present state of art, a monument is of any advantage to the world, and whether poets who boast of work more durable than bronze had not better be satisfied with that kind of durability—these are questions for artists. But there can be no doubt that, if any country ought to put up memorials to its poets, Ireland owes one to Clarence Mangan.

He was one of those peculiar plants of genius that produce only one perfect flower. He gave every promise of a poet, it is true. The sketch of him taken by Sir Frederick Burton as he lay dead in a Dublin hospital (whether he died of cholera or starvation is a nice point for discussion) shows a clear-cut face of great refinement and sensitiveness—a face like Schiller's, and having something in common with the faces of all lyric poets. We read of the brilliant and dreamy blue eyes, of the hair so abundant and so bright with gold before misery whitened it. His very dress was lyrical. The accounts left by his few friends, Gavan Duffy among them, all agree upon the steeple-crowned hat with its immense brim, the tightly-buttoned coat that had once been a kind of drab, the little blue cloak, hardly reaching to the waist, the baggy trousers made for someone better fed, and the enormous umbrella which he kept tucked under the cloak so that it looked like a bagpipe.

The apparition is poetic enough, and it seems never to have varied, except that under opium and drink it grew rather more spectral and dingy, till suddenly it vanished underground. In external circumstance also, Mangan enjoyed every poetic advantage. He was born poor and remained so; he was well-read; he was un-

married; and he lived to forty-six. Nor was his genius hindered by lethargy, or indifference, or any over-scrupulous criticism of himself. He was, on the contrary, rather peculiarly fertile, and Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue, to whom we owe the new edition of his writings, as well as the biography published a few years ago, has discovered over 800 of his poems that appeared in print. So far from being barren, all his work shows the facility and exuberance of a man who writes with ease, and enjoys writing. There was nothing exiguous or stinted about him, and yet, though he was quite unaware of it himself, he reached high excellence only once.

His devoted admirers, of whom I am one, may bring up strong instances to the contrary. They may call to mind poems still familiar to the literary circle in Dublin, such as "O'Hussey's Ode to the Maguire," with its fine ending, so prophetic of De Wet:

"Hugh marched forth to the fight—I grieved to see him so depart;
And lo! to-night he wanders frozen, rain-drenched, sad, betrayed—
But the memory of the lime-white mansions his right hand hath laid
In ashes warms the hero's heart!"

Or they may call to mind the lament that, like the wood-pigeon, keeps asking, "Where, Oh, Kincora?" or the Turkish song of "Karaman," or the Arabic "Howling Song of Al-Mohara," or the personal sorrow of "The Nameless One":

"Him grant a grave to, ye pitying noble,
Deep in your bosoms! There let him dwell!
He, too, had tears for all souls in trouble,
Here and in hell."

Or they may call to mind the regret for the days of the "Barmecides," so productive of Irish parody; or the more genuine pathos of "Twenty Golden Years Ago," not unlike one of Béranger's smiling lamentations over lost youth:

"Wifeless, friendless, flagonless, alone,
Not quite bookless, though, unless I choose,
Left with nought to do, except to groan,
Not a soul to woo, except the Muse—
O! this, this is hard for *me* to bear,
Me, who whilom lived so much *en haut*,
Me, who broke hearts like chinaware
Twenty golden years ago."

I will go further than other admirers, and add the "Lullaby," in which the rod of Moses, the diamond sceptre of Pan, and the Golden Fleece are mingled, in true Irish prodigality, with the glaive of O'Dunn, Diarmid's sword, and Queen Eofa's jewels, as the best possible gifts to keep the baby quiet:

> "And Conal's unpierceable shirt of mail,
> And the shield of Nish, the prince of the Gael,
> These twain for thee, my babe, shall I win,
> With the flashing spears of Achilles and Finn,
> Each high as a pine;
> O, hushaby, hushaby, child of mine!"

For such poems as these, Mangan would be remembered, as he is remembered, in any circle that made a special study of Ireland's literary spirit. Owing to that "Celtic Revival" which has been the one spiritual event of the last ten years, it is quite likely that some of them may appear in our recognized anthologies, and the name of Mangan will become familiar to the English child as one of poor, slovenly, drunken and incapable old Ireland's awful warnings.

By most people, even by admirers, the rest of Mangan's work will never be heard of again. Like all the Irish poets of his time, Mangan was much hampered, even in the use of words. They were writing a foreign language, and working on false models. For they had forgotten their own tongue, and the true power of English was hidden from them by the poetic artifice of their day. Take Mangan on his ordinary level, as in "The Geraldine's Daughter":

> "A beauty all stainless, a pearl of a maiden,
> Has plunged me in trouble, and wounded my heart;
> With sorrow and gloom is my soul overladen,
> An anguish is there that will never depart.

Any Irishman of sixty years ago could have gone on like that to the other side of Godspeed. And to me—perhaps to me alone—there is a certain attraction about that kind of verse, the attraction of a genuine, though slightly faded, gentility. It reminds me of the modest little houses which are still seen in the sweetly mouldering suburbs of Dublin, bearing on their gate-posts of corroded stucco the titles of "Talavera," "Khyber Pass," or

"Maharajpore," to recall the poor, battered, old hero who so trustfully served the foreign and dominant race, and inscribed those proud titles as his sufficient reward. Over such gate-posts, such verses, the sensibility of forty years ago would have shed a tear; and still the angels give them a smile of passing recognition.

But in "The Dark Rosaleen" we have no time to think about forms and words. Critics may tell us there are echoes of a foreigner's English in it still. That does not matter now. The dawdlers in the suburbs of literature may drowse over such things if they please. They may debate with tepid industry whether it was Mangan or Poe who first invented the obvious characteristics of the metre. In "The Dark Rosaleen" we have passed beyond such things. We are borne away to a circle of passion from which tasteful criticism is seen fluttering with all its trumpery in the Paradise of Fools. The winds and stars are round us, and "red lightning lightens through the blood." We have passed into a world of nobler vision, where we behold Ireland incarnate again under the symbol of the Black Little Rose—the *Roisin Dubh*—just as she once appeared to Costello of Ballyhaunis, Red Hugh O'Donnell's wandering singer, who first made that song of such finely woven duplicity that the dull invaders never could be quite sure whether it sang of treason or of love. That early singer, in peril of his life, had said:

"Oh, little rose,
"Let there not be sorrow upon you for what has happened;
"The priests are coming over the waves, they are moving upon the sea.
"Your pardon will come from the Pope of Rome in the East,
"And Spanish wine will not be spared for my Dark Little Rose."*

It was from that verse that Mangan began:

"O my Dark Rosaleen,
Do not sigh, do not weep!
The priests are on the ocean green,
They march along the deep.
There's wine from the royal Pope
Upon the ocean green;
And Spanish ale shall give you hope,
My Dark Rosaleen!
My own Rosaleen!

* Slightly altered from Miss Guiney's translation of the Irish in her "Study of Mangan" (1897).

Shall glad your heart, shall give you hope,
Shall give you health, and help, and hope,
My Dark Rosaleen."

The Gaelic poet, whose name is a shadow, went on:

"It was a long course over which I brought you from yesterday to this day.
Over mountains I went with you, and by sails across the sea,
The Erne I passed at a bound, though it was great with flood,
And there was music of strings on each side of me and my *Roisin Dubh*."

Then Mangan sings:

"Over hills and through dales
Have I roamed for your sake;
All yesterday I sailed with sails
On river and on lake.
The Erne at its highest flood
I dashed across unseen,
For there was lightning in my blood,
My Dark Rosaleen!
My own Rosaleen!
Oh! there was lightning in my blood,
Red lightning lightened through my blood,
My Dark Rosaleen!"

Intermingling the note of human love as though to lead the insensate enemy astray, Costello sings:

"I would walk the dew with you and the desert of the plains,
In the hope to win love from you, or part of my desire.
Sweet little mouth! you promised you have love for me.
Oh, she is the flower of Munster,
My Dark Little Rose!"

But from a further depth of passion comes Mangan's cry, and the ruler must be dull indeed to miss the rebel's devotion here:

"Over dews, over sands,
Will I fly for your weal:
Your holy delicate white hands
Shall girdle me with steel."

The figure of a country rises like a religious vision before some soldier-saint in a ruined chapel of the forest or among Irish hills. She is the Black Rose, the Secret Rose, holy as the Rose of Bethle-

hem. The poet is enamored of her, as ancient citizens were enamored of a city, but it is with a passion how much more tender and profound! She is no imperial state, standing in white-columned security over the seas which her fleets command; but a sly and fugitive spirit, her beauty remains unseen by all except her worshippers. To strange eyes she looks a mournful and profitless thing. Full of sad memories, reviled and held up to derision, bound, tortured, and spat upon, called out to make sport with her wit, starved and driven through the earth, in turn half-strangled and cajoled as a pleasing strain for the nurseries of her tormentors, even to her lovers she takes the disguise of the Little Old Woman, the Kathleen na Houlihan, who sits uncomforted beside the world's highway, or crouches muttering over the peat-fires of her hearth, while under those worn rags, and under the disguise of that wrinkled skin, is hidden the pure form of that Dark Rose whose heart is the consecrated shrine of joy and sorrow:

"All day long, in unrest,
To and fro do I move.
The very soul within my breast
Is wasted for you, love!
The heart in my bosom faints
To think of you, my queen,
My life of life, my saint of saints,
My Dark Rosaleen!
My own Rosaleen!
To hear your sweet and sad complaints,
My life, my love, my saint of saints,
My Dark Rosaleen!"

The poem first appeared in "The Nation," the rebel newspaper of "Young Ireland." It was in 1846, perhaps the blackest year in the unbroken storm of Ireland's history since the Invasion. It may have been for that very reason that the "Dark Rosaleen" so far surpassed anything else that Mangan ever wrote. In the Introduction which John Mitchel, himself one of the greatest writers in "The Nation," prefixed to the selection from Mangan's poems which was published ten years after his death, we find a sentence which, perhaps, explains why it is that this poem stands alone and apart, as something in an utterly different rank of excellence, from the rest of Mangan's work. Mitchel speaks first of the poet's poverty-stricken and miserable life, of his shy and sensi-

tive nature; "modestly craving nothing in the world but celestial, glorified life, seraphic love, and a throne among the immortal gods"; and then, as an explanation of his entire neglect by English critics, he adds:

"Mangan was not only an Irishman,—not only an Irish papist,—not only an Irish papist rebel;—but throughout his whole literary life of twenty years he never deigned to attorn to English criticism, never published a line in any English periodical, or through any English bookseller, never seemed to be aware that there was a British public to please. He was a rebel politically, and a rebel intellectually and spiritually,—a rebel with his whole heart and soul against the whole British spirit of the age."

It was because Mangan found in "The Dark Rosaleen" the fullest expression of that lifelong rebellion that the poem is on quite a different level to the rest of his work. In this alone he passed beyond the ordinary themes and exercises of poetic talent—the amorous addresses, the regrets for the past, the translations from foreign tongues, over which he wasted so much of his life. In nearly all his other verses, he is untrue to himself and only plays the common literary part. They are sometimes pretty, sometimes "literature," and they are never anything greater. But here he gathers up all the deepest forces of his nature, to give us, just for this once, the assurance of something more than a literary man. In this cry of rebellion, prompted by a devotion like a lover's, but more generous and of nobler mood, we find at last the essential spirit of the poet. He was a rebel with his whole heart and soul, says John Mitchel. And his rebellion was inspired by the vision of that sorrowful but endearing shape which was his country—that beggar queen, starving and glorified—that saint of saints, whose spirit shone in gleams of opal. Like himself, she was abused, ruined, and despised, but the light that burned in her heart, burned in his as well. So to her feet he brought his one great gift, and there he uttered the words which expressed the whole purpose of his scorned and distracted life:

"But yet will I rear your throne
Again in golden sheen;
'Tis you shall reign, shall reign alone,
My Dark Rosaleen!
My own Rosaleen!

'Tis you shall have the golden throne,
'Tis you shall reign, and reign alone,
My Dark Rosaleen!

. . . . .

The Judgment Hour must first be nigh
Ere you can fade, ere you can die,
My Dark Rosaleen!"

The "British spirit," against which Mangan was a rebel, heart and soul, now calls this kind of passionate emotion "mere sentiment." That word "sentiment" has a history of some interest. It has seen better days. Once it was used to describe all the higher emotions; and, indeed, it has much the same meaning still, only that once it was used in praise, and now it is invariably used in scorn. I have watched the use of the word by our politicians, leader-writers, and business men for the last ten years, and I find that when they set something aside as "mere sentiment," they really mean that it cannot produce sixpence. The Bishop of Worcester, it is true, lately protested that even "sentiment" cannot always be safely disregarded, but he has not changed the use of the word. To describe a thing as "mere sentiment" is to assume it to be a natural object of indifference or contempt; and because no one was ever sixpence the better for any of the higher emotions, they are all included under the ban of the same word.

Since the British spirit inevitably, therefore, regards Mangan's passionate devotion as mere sentiment (for it never could produce sixpence), it is worth while to discover what that spirit thinks the natural and advantageous attitude towards the object of his adoration would be. And let us take the British spirit at its very best, as it is represented, for instance, every week by a newspaper which is the source of true culture to the thoughtful middle classes, and is by them justly regarded as moderate and reasonable in its judgments, besides being capable of forgiveness towards our defeated opponents, and of sympathetic tenderness to the lower animals. Such a newspaper certainly reveals the British spirit in the most intellectual and benevolent form, and it is in a spirit of exuberant benevolence that it comments as follows upon some visit of the King to Ireland:

"The Celtic Irish have never, owing to their want of minerals, been able to share fully in the solid wealth of Britain. Their island, though beautiful, has never attracted the sportsman and the tourist, who every

year carry so large an income to the happy kingdom north of the Tweed, where even the foibles of the people are just the foibles Englishmen comprehend, and therefore forgive. . . .

"Much of all this it is impossible to alter, as impossible as to change a pasture into a mine by merely desiring the alteration; but something can be done which is worth doing. The Court can visit Ireland. . . .

"Crowds will flock where the King has found it pleasant to live, crowds whose wealth, if it does not exactly fertilize as a new trade would, still produces variety, excitement, a break in that melancholy monotony of which the Irishman through all his literature is so apt to complain, as one of the evils to which he is unjustly subjected."*

I wish the writer had explained exactly where in Irish literature he found the Irishman so apt to complain of that melancholy monotony. He says it is everywhere, and I suppose he must have instances by the score, all unknown to myself. But everyone will admit that in this passage we do find the British spirit in benevolent, healthy, and fullblown perfection. By this spirit we are taught to see a country's greatest happiness in coal-pits and iron foundries, or, failing them, in rich visitors who will convert the peasantry into gamekeepers, gillies, and caddies. And, next to pits or parasites, this exponent of the British spirit likes to see a Court, which he regards as a thing to be desired, not from any devotion to a noble line, or as an ideal of kingship, or as a symbol of respect for some great ruler, but because it would attract crowds "whose wealth, if it did not exactly fertilize as a new trade would, still produces variety, excitement, a break in that melancholy monotony"—and so on. Variety, excitement, and a break—these are the nearest approach to spiritual blessings which this typical writer can imagine; and even these, though the products of wealth, are only a kind of second-best, for the wealth of crowds attending the Court "does not exactly fertilize as a new trade would."

We have come a long way from Mangan's "Dark Rosaleen." We have come the immeasurable breadth of St. George's Channel. We have crossed to the sphere of the British spirit, and, from this English shore, the Dark Rosaleen certainly does look a little unlucrative. She is less fertilizing even than a Court, much less than a new trade. No one was ever sixpence the better on her account, except the police. How different things appear in this happy land, where there is always a tourist or a golfer in sight, if

* *The Spectator:* July 25, 1903.

there is not a mine nor a factory! Here we see a real Court, and "crowds will flock where the King has found it pleasant to live." Here new trades fertilize on every side, and from ten thousand chimneys the clouds drop fatness. Here Comfort builds her shrine, and the law of the Golden Mean prevails, banishing the falsehood of extremes, and pointing to the example of our City Fathers to prove the desirability of "broadening slowly down." Here the wayward child of passionate devotion is suffocated at birth, and a "non-committal attitude" succeeds to all the wealth of prudential reservations. Here is the home of common sense; here the land of that British spirit against which Mangan was a rebel, heart and soul.

No one would deny the great advantages of such a spirit. To be sure, it is exposed to the drawback that, as a recent writer on English education has said, "common sense has never yet furnished motive powers for great objects,"* and great objects have counted for something in the world's history. But, apart from great objects, the British spirit can always pride itself with justice upon its sanity, its caution, its accomplishment of definite purposes by small degrees, its substantial prosperity, and entire freedom from the inexplicable sorrows and passions that rock the soul. These are blessings that Mangan never knew; they are beyond the reach of the Dark Rosaleen's worshippers, and probably he never realized how soothing is their influence upon the mind. Had he done so, he might have been tempted to abandon his rebellion, to make terms with the invader, and to seek the rewards which the British spirit undoubtedly can bestow upon its own children, and on all who follow its precepts.

That is the temptation to which we are all exposed. We all feel the attraction of the British spirit, and the blessings of Golden Mediocrity are very tangible. We like its definite aims, its general cheerfulness, its visible sweeps. It is not always that we can remain, like Mangan, rebels against it, heart and soul, and preserve an unshaken fealty to that Dark Rosaleen who is the Ireland of the spirit. Yet we know for certain that in all great enterprises—in the arts, love, war, and every important affair of life—the only part that counts is the part that exceeds moderation; the part that is sometimes called "passion" and sometimes "sentiment," that disregards worldly interests, has no personal aims, and sets no

* Mrs. Emily Crawford in "Victoria, Queen and Ruler."

limits to its desire, admiration, or rage. "Prudence," said William Blake, "is a rich, ugly old maid, courted by Incapacity," and all who would remain true, like Mangan, to the Dark Queen of the soul must leave those wooers to the mediocre progeny likely to fill their well-appointed nurseries, while they themselves pursue the road into the austere land of excess. An austere land we may call it, for passion burns up all pretty adornments and signs of ease, so that, where she passes, the country is bare as a desert. But through it the adventurous road leads to the world's end, where laws shrivel up, and duty vanishes like an ineffectual ghost.

Men of any nation may thus become champions of the Dark Rose. For every soul is a disunited Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, nor is spiritual success to be won except by persistent rebellion against that predominant partner, which is the commonplace. When John Mitchel identified this partner with the British spirit, he was, perhaps, unnecessarily harsh. There is no need to bring the British spirit into the question at all, since, as we know from Goethe, the commonplace is always endeavoring to lay the bonds of its dominion on every one among us.

HENRY W. NEVINSON.

THE FOLLY OF CHINESE EXCLUSION.

BY HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT, AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY OF WESTERN NORTH AMERICA," ETC.

PRIOR to the discovery of gold in California, there were but few Chinese in America. Then the influence which penetrated every industry and every quarter of the globe aroused to activity the dormant energies even of the almond-eyed Celestial; and, among the five hundred vessels which lay anchored in San Francisco Bay during the winter of 1849, were seen a few junks of the Asiatic type, abandoned, like the more pretentious craft, by all save perhaps a solitary keeper. All the late occupants of this promiscuous shipping formed part of the inrushing fifty thousand, of every clime and color, that flitted restlessly about the Sierra foothills in search of large and immediate wealth. A hundred evanescent towns sprang up amidst hundreds of mining-camps, most of them dying before fairly drawing the breath of life. On the outskirts of these towns, or at a little distance from the mining-camps, with now and then a retired camp exclusively their own, were seen nests of Chinese in brush huts, the first of that hypothetical horde which, we were assured, was soon to overwhelm Christendom.

As every one knows, there was at this time no lawful government in California, Congress being engaged over the question of its admission as a slave State or a free State. It was a new and open wilderness, with none at hand to deny the right to any to enter and gather at pleasure. At first, no thought was given to this or any other right. But, presently, the American mind began to consider: "Is this gold, for which we fought in Mexico, to go without price or restriction to others the same as to ourselves?" To Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Germans, bluster was all that the American miners deemed it prudent at that time to

offer; but Mexicans, or "greasers" as they were called, Italians or "Dagoes," Kanakas, negroes, and above all the mild-mannered man from China, the rightful owners of the soil did not hesitate to face with guns, and sometimes to kill. For, as naturally as water seeks a level, so men unrestrained by force of law seek some object weaker than themselves on which to vent their prejudices and passions. The Japanese, not having yet emerged from their chrysalis state, were not present in any considerable numbers; but Indians and Chinese afforded their masters easy and interesting exercise. It required evidence almost as palpable as finding the horns and hoofs of a "cow critter" within a mile of them to justify the extermination of an Indian *rancheria;* whereas the occupation of good diggings by Chinese was reason enough for driving them away with blows, or even with slaughter if they offered resistance.

The persecution of the Chinese has continued from that day to this, their good qualities as patient laborers — with economy, temperance, thrift, and inoffensiveness — being their chief and only crimes. Unable to hold rich claims beside their covetous masters, they betook themselves to gleaning from abandoned diggings, content with four dollars a day at first, and finally with one dollar, while other miners must have four times as much. The State passed laws for their expulsion, as soon as there was a State; and, when informed that the matter was one for the general Government alone to handle, the Sacramento Legislature imposed a foreign miner's tax of sixteen dollars a month at first, with a view to prohibiting the rewashing of tailings. As a rule, this tax was enforced only against the Chinese, white miners refusing to pay it.

With the exaltation of labor in the towns and cities, the cry became loud and vehement: "The Chinese must go!" It became the watchword of the press, and the plank in every political platform, for the Chinaman had no vote and he never read newspapers. It was not a question of principle, but of place. The facts of the case, the right or justice or fairness of it, had nothing to do with it. Any newspaper favoring the Chinese might close its doors; any politician even treating the subject fairly must step down and out. For so the other working-men decreed, American, Irish and Dagoes, French, Dutch and negroes, all who had a vote to sell. Anything black or white was proper

material for American citizenship; yellow was the only off-color. But even the yellow race, with sage discrimination, is now divided, the Japanese being admitted, while the best working foreign element in the world, the least harmful to American politics and people, the much needed Chinese, are excluded.

From first to last, this has been the chief and only cause and front of their offending. They had no vote; they did not care to become American citizens; they wished only to work, earn a little money, go back home to China to enjoy it, and finally to die there. Charges were heaped up against them which seemed to satisfy Dennis Kearney and his sand-lotters, but were mere talk and twaddle to the unprejudiced, even the press and politicians, who used Asiatic and American alike for their own purposes, knowing them to be untrue, or at least irrelevant. "They will not amalgamate; they care not for our institutions; they take work from the white man; they do not spend their money here, but take it back to China."

A fair interpretation of which turns every charge into a mark of merit. They do not come here to meddle with what does not concern them, to interfere with and further degrade our politics by breeding corruption or holding office; they do not care for our learning, morals, or religion, having those which suit them better; if they take work from the white man, it is for the most part work which the white man does not want and will not do, ditch-making and drudgery. True, the Chinaman would be here in a thousand factories if we would let him, and so to a great extent we do without these fundamental industries of progress, preferring to let the Chinese and Japanese turn our cotton into cloth in their own countries after they have learned from us how to do it. Is this wise? Is it in the line of progress? Half of his earnings the Chinaman spends here; if he takes the other half of his well-earned dollar-a-day home to his wife and children, he leaves more than its value in substantial improvements. Do the others as much who carry off to Europe and squander there every year wealth for which they never labored, and which represents no accomplished work—more of it than all the laborers of Asia would carry away in return for their labor in a century?

One may go about for a whole decade without seeing a drunken or disorderly Chinaman. The Chinaman is seldom found in schools or hospitals supported at public expense. I can hardly

imagine how one of them would look begging or soliciting, or insulting a woman on the street, or posing as a policeman, or running for Congress. The argument of the exclusionists, now becoming somewhat stale as its absurdity appears more and more apparent, that the Chinese will not become one of us, marry our daughters, manipulate our primaries, run for office and rule the country, is only an enumeration of reasons why they should be admitted to do the lower class of work which white men do not care to do.

True, some of the Celestials smoke opium, but so do white people in London; and this the Chinaman would not now be doing had not England forced her East-Indian product upon them, at the cannon's mouth, when they did not want it. Besides, white men everywhere drink whiskey, or its equivalent, and with ten times the evil effects which result from opium-smoking. Stoned and insulted on the streets of Christian cities of the American Republic, the Chinese pack themselves away in quarters of their own, which reek too often of vice and crime, but which are confined entirely to themselves. Have the cities of Christendom ever been free from such places, inhabited by other nationalities?

The truth is, these knights of the sand-lots do not, and never did, care to do the work for which we need the Chinaman. Organized labor does not even like country life and farm work. At one time, the California fruit-raisers' chief dependence was upon the Chinese, whose quick perceptions and deft fingers were superior in everything but the handling of horses. In picking and packing, in wineries, in canneries, as cooks and house servants, they were the best the country has ever had, better than the country can elsewhere obtain. When they were forbidden to come, the Japanese flocked in to take their place, but they do not fill it as well as it was filled before.

The Chinese were an important factor in the construction of the Panama Railway, and of the first overland railroad, without which assistance there would have been long and vexatious delays. They are the best force obtainable to-day for the vast irrigating dam-work and ditch-work in progress and in contemplation. In the reclamation of the Colorado and other deserts, their equals cannot be found. Next to the Jamaica negroes, and the natives of the Isthmus, who are better acclimated, they are the best and most available material for work on the Panama Canal.

Is it not absurd, therefore, that this most available, most useful and efficient, and least harmful, of all labor elements, should be excluded from a country whose progress and prosperity depend upon the faithful execution of this class of work, and all in order that politicians may make capital for themselves by crying out against it? All the Asiatic laborers who ever came to this country, or who are likely to come, are incapable of doing as great injury as a single politician, who, to secure his election to office, goes about systematically to stir up the worst passions of the working people, and arouse them to the commission of unlawful acts by incendiary declamations and the printed recitals of imaginary evils.

Some have suggested danger to the Republic in thus leaving open the portal for the unrestricted inpouring of Asiatic hordes to kill and drive us into the eastern ocean. Yet, they must know that the laboring man in China dares scarcely go from one province into another unprotected. The price of passage to California is to them equivalent to a fortune, and the journey like the journey into another world. In times past, he who adventured alone had often to sell or pledge his wife for the necessary means, while contractors for coolie labor would not bring men over at less than some fixed price. As for the rest, the law of supply and demand regulates it. It is a matter of record that, when wages in California fell below fifteen dollars a month, Chinese immigration not only ceased but the tide turned the other way. Chinamen will not leave home and face the cost and dangers of the ocean voyage unless they can have work at remunerative rates; and work is all that they desire.

Why should the Chinese want America? What would they do with it? They are passionately attached to their homes, if not to their country, preferring almost the loss of life to the loss of queue, which forbids their return; while to deposit their bones for their eternal rest in a foreign soil, is to consign their souls to perdition. Instinct and tradition, running back for many centuries, have so intensified their exclusiveness, their dislike of change and hatred of strangers, as to make it little likely that they will ever wish to move to this country. Yet they are not patriotic. They do not know or care, half of them, by whom they are ruled, or how. They do not know or care why Japan wants Korea and Russia wants the earth; their ambition is limited to

the desire simply to go somewhere, to the Philippines, Australia, or America, and work and earn a little more than the pittance which they get in China. All this is set down against them in arguments for their exclusion, whereas it stands among the best of reasons for their admission, as they have no disposition to engage in politics, mob-law, strikes, and that vicious unrest which is bringing our country to the verge of ruin.

HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT.

A GLANCE AT WORLD-POLITICS.

BY SYDNEY BROOKS.

Not long ago—it was, however, before the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war—there appeared in one of the English reviews an article on "The United States of Europe." The writer ventured the opinion that "Europe now seems almost ripe for federation"; that an almost identical system of education, the decay of theological dogma, the universality of the press, of commerce and of travel, Jewish domination in the newspaper office, in the theatre and in politics, the common restlessness under the common burden of huge armaments, the growing sense of the solidarity of labor, and the pressure of American competition, are all simultaneously working towards a cosmopolitanism that has within it the germ of federation. The idea, of course, is not a new one. It was proclaimed with enthusiasm as long ago as the sixties, it brightened the closing years of Victor Hugo's life, and in our own day, even within the last few weeks, M. Leroy-Beaulieu has insisted on the economic necessity of its fulfilment. Nor is it inconceivable that the long results of time may really convert it from an aspiration to a policy. Already, even in its tentative and incipient stages, a modifying influence goes out from it to move men's hearts and minds, if not to shape their actions. The most matter-of-fact observer, in attempting a forecast of the European future, could not, at any rate, wholly pass by the tokens and possible consequences of this new impulse. Here I am rather concerned with the obstacles that lie in the path of its realization, the immediate obstacles of politics, national ambitions and racial tendencies. They are formidable enough, and their removal is imperative. But it is permissible, and not perhaps altogether quixotic, to hope that their disappearance, whether by war or by negotiation, may help to clear a space, a mental and moral as well

as a political space, for the larger movement. The only point I would insist on is that Europe is still too much in flux to permit of the concentration necessary for the fruition of so vast and resplendent an ideal. Putting aside altogether the question whether for such a being as man in such a world as the present the ideal ever can be attainable, one may still safely assert that the political problems that confront the peoples of Europe, the array of vexed and in some cases crucial questions that still remain unsolved, must postpone its attainment well-nigh indefinitely.

Is there, for instance, any one who, looking to the past histories of France and Prussia, can regard the present disposition of Alsace-Lorraine as fixed in perpetuity? That the French are not at this moment thirsting or clamoring for *la revanche* is true enough. It is not less true that within the last few years, since the death of President Faure, a reaction against militarism has set in among the French. Their old exuberance of enthusiasm for the Dual Alliance has palpably toned down of late, nor is it fanciful to detect a reviving consciousness that the eighteenth-century primacy of France from the Neva to the Tagus in intellect, art, science and manners is still the ambition most suited to the national genius. Of all the countries in Europe, France is, indeed, to-day the most contented and the most happily placed. The Third Republic has forced, even upon a world imbued with the tradition of French "fickleness" and "instability," the conviction of permanence and security. Already it has lasted longer than any régime since the old monarchy collapsed in 1792. It has survived repeated crises and resisted without serious difficulty all efforts to upset it. It defeated the Royalists in a pitched battle on May 16, 1877, and the Royalists themselves have since completed the rout. It came out victorious from the long struggle with the Church between 1880 and 1885; it withstood the temptation to Cæsarism in 1889; the Panama scandals failed to shake it; and from the long and hideous nightmare of the Dreyfus affair, in which the rag-tag and bob-tail of Clericalism, Anti-Semitism, Royalism and Nationalism—encouraged by a few, but only a few, restless soldiers—were drawn up against it, it has emerged with fresh confidence and vigor. Beyond this, the Third Republic has founded an immense colonial empire, has armed the nation to the teeth without impairing its republicanism, and,

Anti-Clerical though it is, has forced the official approbation of the Vatican. These are remarkable achievements, but even they pale before the greatest of all, the formation of the Franco-Russian Alliance, which not only consecrates the Republic's international position but immeasurably strengthens it at home. Cardinal Manning once remarked that to write the history of France was like writing the history of a kaleidoscope. The remark holds good for the Republic if one fixes one's attention exclusively on ministers and political parties. But, if one looks beyond this sliding procession of cabinets and groups, there is discoverable in the background a continuity of policy and purpose such as no autocracy could have exceeded. Beneath a fluid and shifting surface there has always been a real stability of ideas. There has also been a stability of men. The real rulers of France are the unknown and unseen heads of the great departments, the permanent officials. Ministries come and go, but these officials remain, and under their hands the internal policy of the country takes shape and substance, undisturbed by changing portfolios. It is true that this endless succession of fly-blown Cabinets argues a certain inexperience in and perhaps unfitness for the workings of Parliamentary government. But it has meant much for France that, instead of trying to overthrow a régime, her politicians have been able to concentrate upon the downfall of individual ministers. It relieved them to overthrow Jules Ferry when his Tonkin policy led to a disaster to French arms, but they did not undo his work. To have brought him low was enough; his fall appeased them, and his policy was left untouched. A ministerial "crisis" in France is more often a safety-valve than not.

It was a Frenchman who claimed that the regeneration of France since the war, the readiness with which she paid off the indemnity and the splendid alacrity with which she has remodelled her military forces and safeguarded her international position, constitute in their display of patience and self-denial "the greatest moral victory ever won by a nation over itself." No one, I imagine, not even a German, would care to dispute that dictum. France has shown more than once in her history that she cannot be ruined, but never more completely or with more admirable resolution than in the last quarter of a century. And now at last she is reaping the full harvest of her efforts. The nervousness and irritability of ten years ago have given way to an assured

self-confidence. The Boulevards have learned the trick of smiling even at the Kaiser's speeches—the same speeches that in the eighties sent every Frenchman's right hand to his left side. Even the spectacle of Germany adding 800,000 a year to her population while the French birth-rate little more than holds its own, even the precariousness of the national budget and the tumultuous quarrels with the Church, cannot disturb the conviction that France, internally and externally, is secure; that the Republic has undoubtedly and finally triumphed; and that, with Spain bound to her by the chain of finance, with the Tunis question now past the danger point and Italy happily reconciled, and with the Franco-Russian Alliance and the double line of fortresses to guard the eastern frontier, her international position is beyond successful assault.

Moreover, the one serious blunder that marred, up to quite recently, the external policy of France has now been removed. France had and has a righteous ambition to be not only a great Continental but a great Colonial power. Her twofold aim brought her across the path of Germany, the strongest military, and England, the strongest naval, Power in the world; and she made no attempt to conciliate either. The pacific cautiousness of her foreign policy was, indeed, guarantee enough that, so far as the Continent was concerned, France was exceedingly unlikely either to provoke or to be drawn into war. But her colonial policy, which was haphazard rather than cautious, provocative rather than pacific, was at once a drain on French resources and a menace to her relations with England. At more than one sinister and perilous point, it brought England and France face to face. France has, of course, as legitimate a right to an Empire as Great Britain; but it is incontestable that the French colonies are, if anything, a source of weakness to France, that they impoverish without reinforcing her, and that she risked more on their behalf than they were really worth. It seemed at one time as though England would oust Germany from the position of the supreme object of French hatred, and as though the restlessness and military impatience of the nation would be focussed into a glowing animosity against Great Britain. That danger, a very real one some five years ago, has now passed. The Anglo-French Agreement, it is not too much to say, is as much a guarantee of peace in the prosecution by France of her Imperial ambitions as is the Dual

Alliance in the protection of her eastern frontier. I question, indeed, whether England and France have ever stood nearer together in sympathies and mutual comprehension, and in the desire to have done with the old traditional enmity and suspiciousness than at this moment. It may, indeed, prove that, in inviting France to the occupation of Morocco, Great Britain has unconsciously proposed to her a task compared with which all her previous Imperial ventures, in Tonkin, Algeria, Madagascar and Nigeria, will prove mere bagatelles; and that some such catastrophe as overwhelmed the Italians at Adowa may even now be maturing for France on the frontiers of the Shereefian Empire. That, however, is mere speculation. What is certain is that, for the space of another generation at least, the possibility of any serious clash between the colonial policies of Great Britain and France has been so enormously minimized that one might say it has been averted. And with the lifting of this, by far the heaviest cloud that menaced the French prospect, the Republic is left free to follow, with undistracted assurance, the pathway of internal development. There have, of course, been times when to the foreign eye France may have seemed more brilliant and imposing. But it is doubtful whether she has ever been more prosperous, more sure of herself or more contented. In no country except the United States does civilization strike deeper; nowhere is there so much diffused comfort and taste, so much thrift and humble elegance, such wealth of placid, industrious, and affectionate home-life. If Paris has decayed into a mere cosmopolitan pleasure-ground, if democracy has destroyed the *salon* and sectionalized that brilliant society that was once the model and despair of Europe, France as a whole has gathered fresh energy and steadfastness from her reverses and a chastened respect for the advantages of peace.

And yet, in spite of all this, it is no paradox to insist that the question of Alsace-Lorraine is still, as it has been for the past thirty years, the pivot of European politics. How far France has really acquiesced in the loss of her two provinces, and in their retention by Germany, is a most difficult point. My own strong impression is that while *la revanche* is no longer a policy, it is assuredly an aspiration, dumb and unheeded, perhaps, by the present generation, but needing only a crisis and a chance to find full and menacing voice. France, that is to say, has grown reason-

able about it, recognizes facts, and will not perpetually talk about altering them till the opportunity comes for action. Then —then, I think, she will do what she can. The Dual Alliance, although based on "existing territorial arrangements," cannot, when French policy is looked at as a whole, be altogether separated from the hope of recovering Alsace-Lorraine. But primarily that compact will endure, because for France it represents not aggression, but insurance, the need for which every year that reveals to German eyes her relative weakness in resources only emphasizes the more. I know of no price that it would not be well worth the while of France to pay so long as the Alliance is able—as hitherto it has been able—to lift that awful horror of invasion, that sickening sense of helplessness under the shadow of which, a bare fifteen or twenty years ago, the nation was rebuilding itself as from nothing. It would, however, be possible to leave the Dual Alliance out of account, and yet maintain that Alsace-Lorraine is the dominating influence of Continental affairs, to which all else is ultimately referable. No country, for example, can become friendly to Germany without arousing in France a suspicious anxiety that may and, in Italy's case, did develop into downright hostility. No country, again, can draw near to France without reminding Germany that her Continental position is one of extreme precariousness and without disturbing her policy overseas. These one may take to be axioms of European politics, and each has been abundantly verified within the last two years. It was the explosion of anger with which England greeted the Anglo-German Agreement in Venezuela that first convinced France of the hostility of the British people to any sort of compact with Germany. From that moment Anglo-French relations began automatically to improve; and their improvement created a displeasure in Germany that culminated, when the terms of the Anglo-French Agreement were published, in an outburst of irrepressible annoyance not wholly free from alarm.

So far as Alsace-Lorraine is concerned, Germany's policy is simply to hold what she has won; but to hold it as tactfully and with as much deference to French susceptibilities as possible. Just as Bismarck after Sadowa spared no pains to reconcile Austria to the accomplished fact, so for the past fifteen years the Kaiser has striven to induce France to let bygones be bygones. He has not succeeded, but he has come nearer to success than

any one would have thought possible. If it has proved beyond his powers of persuasiveness to command acquiescence, he has at least contrived to dull the edge of a too active and voluble resentment. Situated as Germany is, a beleagured fortress with allied foes on the east and west, she has no option but to court with all possible adroitness the friendship of each. Not that the Wilhelmstrasse sets an equal store by the good-will of Russia and of France. The latter nation may be said to have definitely turned her back on the temptation of a single-handed dash for Alsace-Lorraine. If the dash is ever made it will be as the result of, and concurrent with, an embroilment that will fully distract the attention and resources of Germany elsewhere. The Germans, for their part, know well enough that the storm which will shake their Empire, if any storm can, will come from the east and not from the west. The keynote of their Continental policy is, therefore, and inevitably must be, friendship with Russia. Nothing that any other Power could offer them would in the least compensate for the loss of Russian good-will. That is a fundamental proposition the truth of which is now, I think, universally admitted, even at last in Great Britain, where the notion has too long prevailed that by graceful concessions it might be possible to use Germany as a sort of make-weight against Russia. No delusion could well be greater. Thanks to the skilfulness of her diplomacy, Germany has not yet had to make sacrifices to secure the political friendliness of her eastern neighbor, but she never lets a chance slip by of doing her an easy, good-natured service and of convincing St. Petersburg that "the enemy" is Great Britain. It is a difficult game to play, and as time goes on it will become more difficult still, for the reason that the central condition which alone made it feasible is fast disappearing. So long as Germany had, and could say that she had, no direct interest in what is loosely called the Near-Eastern Question, close and even confidential relations with St. Petersburg rested on a more or less natural basis. But to-day we find the Kaiser accepted at the Yildiz Kiosk as Turkey's best and only friend in Europe. His officers have drilled the Ottoman army; whatever of European varnish is visible in the Turkish government is of German make. Russian authority at Constantinople is founded on the fears of the Sultan; Germany's on a business-like friendship. The Kaiser did the Sultan a signal service when he thwarted the Con-

cert of Europe after the Armenian massacres. His reward lies in Syria and Asia Minor, where the German banker, commercial traveller, engineer and colonist are carving out a sphere of commercial and political interest which may yet be a veritable part of the Fatherland. If Germany is ever seriously to emulate the Imperial career of Great Britain, it is not in Africa or in the Pacific or in South America or in China that she will have to look for the development of Greater Germany, but in Asia Minor, along the valley of the Euphrates and on the Persian Gulf. That is a fact which, by bringing Germany and Russia unescapably face to face, cannot but revolutionize sooner or later their past relations. Nothing in the whole sphere of European politics is more pregnant with possibilities than this, and anything even remotely connected with it becomes important. The quarrel between the French Republic and the Vatican, for instance, if it ends, as it well may, in a Papal withdrawal of the protectorate that France, as the eldest daughter of the Church, exercises over Eastern Catholic converts—a protectorate that affords a hundred pretexts for "intervention"—and if the Kaiser, as is quite conceivable, for he has no closer friends than the Sultan and the Pope, falls heir to the French position, may easily advance the inexorable conflict between Teuton and Slav one step nearer.

It is, of course, unfair to judge Germany by the Pan-Germans. But it is not altogether beside the mark to sketch in cursory outline the future which Pan-Germanism has pictured to itself, especially when it is a future for which the Kaiser, the one statesman in Europe who has a real touch of genius, actively works. To found one empire in China and another in Asia Minor without colliding with Russia; to create a sphere of influence in South America without rousing the suspicions of the United States; to absorb all of Africa that she can lay hands on, not violently but by purchase and negotiation; to collect coaling stations in the Pacific and the West Indies, and generally to be the first and highest bidder whenever any territory anywhere comes into the market—to do all this, and yet maintain peace, is in itself a varied and grandiose programme. Yet while the Kaiser and the Pan-Germans are quite sincere in saying that peace is the greatest of German interests—an aggressive peace, that is, a peace in which German interests are very vigorously looked after—it is their obvious policy to set England at odds with France,

France with Russia, and Russia with England. And this after all, is but half the Pan-German programme. Those who have followed German political literature with any care know well enough that the desire to obtain a firm footing on the shores of the North Sea has been present for generations. The settlement of the northeastern frontier of Holland by the Congress of Vienna was a bitter disappointment to the Prussian national party of the day; and somewhere at the back of the German mind is a more or less inchoate resolve to rectify that mistake. The idea of forcing or enticing Holland into a Customs Union, to be followed afterwards by a military and naval convention, has never been abandoned. It is still less likely to be thrown overboard in the future. The further Germany ventures in *Weltpolitik*—and Americans will do well to note this—the more steadily will she keep her eyes on the Dutch colonies. Nor is this the limit of the ambitions of Pan-Germanism. Just across the southwest borders, in Austria-Hungary, are some eight million Germans, growing year by year less and less satisfied with their position in the realm of the Hapsburgs and insensibly gravitating towards Berlin. These Pan-Germanism has already marked for its own. Both in Berlin and in Vienna exist fully-formed and active parties with no other plank in their platform than the consolidation of all German-speaking Austrians with the German Empire. If their projects ever come to a head, only one more short step will be needed and Germany will debouch on the Adriatic. Pan-Germanism will not be satisfied until it has planted one foot at Rotterdam and another at Trieste.

These, however, though they should never be forgotten or lost sight of, are not the cardinal points of German policy. In its ultimate influence on *Weltpolitik,* German policy will be represented, above all, by two movements. One is the impulse that is dragging her to expand in Asia Minor in the very face of Russia; the other is her vigorous resolve to be a great maritime and a great Colonial power. This latter ambition has already had the effect of emancipating England from the pro-German influences which, almost since the beginning of Queen Victoria's reign, have been allowed an altogether excessive share in the direction of British policy. It is now a conviction, a somewhat angry conviction, on the part of the great majority of Englishmen, that the Kaiser's dictum, "Our future is on the water," when translated into the

language of the ordinary German, means that England's must be somewhere else, that Germany's commercial, naval and colonial ambitions can only be fulfilled at the partial expense of Great Britain; that the two countries must by the necessities of the case be rivals; that their goal is too much the same for their interests to be identical; that Germany's longing for sea-power, colonies and commercial dominion is, in short, the one dangerous menace with which England is now confronted.

It will thus be seen that Germany is playing a hazardous game, one in which, with her unhappy and universal knack of rousing suspicion and dislike, success is hardly conceivable. Moreover, she is conducting it on a basis that is not in all ways as secure as it might be. It is a common and not unexaggerated saying that one German out of ten is disaffected to the Empire; some because they are Southern Catholics and resent the rulership of Protestant Prussia; some because they are ultra-Liberals of a rather doctrinaire type and impatient of everything short of the full shibboleths of democracy, impatient of Prussian paternalism, of a Parliamentary régime without the party system, of ministers responsible to the Crown instead of to the people, of the ubiquitous police agent, of whatever stands in the way of the dominion of popular rule; others, again, because they are Social Democrats and in opposition to everything, and especially to militarism; others from an old-standing jealousy of Prussia and resentment against "Prussian arrogance." The gathering stringency of her relations with Russia, with Great Britain, and the barely veiled suspicion with which her policy is watched by the United States are in themselves enough to give Germany pause; but it is barely too much to say that her most persistent and capable foes are to be found within her own borders. It is true that the Triple Alliance still exists and, I think, will again be renewed; but it is to be noted that Italy has abandoned Colonial ambitions, has settled down to the humdrum and vitally practical work of domestic regeneration and is to-day in far closer touch and sympathy with France than with either of her allies; and that Austria, distracted, polyglot Austria, draws yearly nearer to an internal crisis that may prove to be an internal convulsion. There is no guarantee that the Alliance will be renewed, if at all, more than once; and it might even now be within the competence of a shrewd and resolute diplomacy to break it up.

The close of the present war seems likely to open up a situation of extraordinary opportunities. To Great Britain those opportunities will present themselves with peculiar significance. The chief objects of British policy are (1) to maintain the closest possible relations with the United States; (2) to come to a good understanding with France and, if possible, with Russia; (3) to uphold Japan and the open door in the Far East; (4) to checkmate Germany; and (5) to consolidate and develop the Empire. Anglo-American relations are to-day as every sensible Englishman and every sensible American would have them. Anglo-French relations are so vastly improved, and the improvement holds out such a real promise of stability, that a *rapprochement* between England and the ally of France—provided always that Japan in no way suffers by it—becomes an almost logical consequence. The results of the war that is now raging will emphasize not merely the logic, but the need, of at least attempting such an arrangement. Russia's sea-power is enormously diminished; her military prestige and her military effectiveness are both greatly weakened. The first Power to benefit by such a condition is Germany; it lessens, for the time being almost destroys, the menace on her eastern frontier. But anything that eases the military situation allows Germany to turn to her naval preparations with a new vigor and the command of greater resources. The collapse of Russia, even though it be only temporary, increases, therefore, the danger to England by enabling Germany to concentrate her attention and wealth on the building of her fleet. That is one reason why, when peace comes, England should endeavor to negotiate an understanding with Russia. Another reason is that, if England declines, the attempt will probably be made by Germany. Germany as a Power, if not the chief Power, with whom Russia will have to reckon in the Balkans, in the settlement of the Dardanelles question, and also in Asia Minor and the Persian Gulf, has really more to offer than Great Britain; and the exhaustion of Russia would afford her the best of all chances of striking a profitable bargain. There is, of course, the alternative of an Anglo-German Convention, but this is not only inadmissible, in the present temper of the British people, but would only add to the sum of Anglo-Russian difficulties. Russia's hold over England consists in her ability not to conquer India—for that she has neither the desire nor the capacity—but to distract England's at-

tention, increase her perplexities and dissipate her resources, by stirring up trouble on the Indian frontier. In the Near East, England has virtually abandoned her traditional policy. So far as one can see, she will never again fight to preserve the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. In the Far East—again with the proviso that Japan's legitimate ambitions are satisfied—she wants no more from Russia than an equality of commercial opportunity. There is hardly anything Russia wants from England except permission to fulfil her destiny. The destiny of Russia is to get down to the sea. I do not see how in the long run she can be prevented from debouching on the Persian Gulf. There is a school of British publicists which declares that, if all outstanding difficulties with Russia throughout Asia can be settled by allowing her appearance on the Persian Gulf, she ought to be welcomed there. A Russian port on the Gulf, they argue, so long as Great Britain remains mistress of the seas, will be no more a menace to India than St. Petersburg itself. That, however, is not the view of the British Government. The British Government, though apparently not averse to Germany's advent to the Persian Gulf, is resolved to exclude Russia from its shores. We reach, therefore, a deadlock, and no way out of it at once satisfactory to England and to Russia has yet been suggested. Nevertheless, the necessity of preventing a Russo-German compact, with its inevitable Anglophobiac tendency, the conviction that of the two countries it is infinitely more desirable that Russia rather than Germany should be brought into a near relationship with Great Britain, the effects of the Anglo-French Agreement, and the opportunity that is opened by the long course of internal reconstruction that must follow Russia's emergence from her war with Japan, all point to an effort on England's part to come to terms. Unless an arrangement can be arrived at, the Persian Gulf and India will continue to dominate Anglo-Russian relations and to lay the seed of future wars.

With the withdrawal of Russia, for another generation at least, from her active and somewhat disturbing rôle in Far-Eastern politics, and with the rise of Japan to an ascendency such as no other nation has yet obtained, either in quality or material strength, the chances are that China will gradually cease to agitate the politics of the world. How far the supremacy of Japan will react on her relations with the United States, in the matter,

for instance, of Japanese emigration to Hawaii, the Philippines and America, is an interesting point that perhaps has not yet been sufficiently considered. But it may be taken for granted that the open door has been brought immeasurably nearer to actuality than it was before the war broke out; and that in the peace negotiations America will make her weight felt in the direction of commercial equality. It is in the Far East that the United States will play her largest part in the drama of world-politics, and it is there that the community of interests which joins her to Great Britain will ripen into practical cooperation.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

CAN CONGRESS CONSTITUTIONALLY GRANT INDEPENDENCE TO THE FILIPINOS?

BY H. A. AND J. H. C.

I.—IT CAN.

It is not the purpose of this article to discuss the right or wrong of our retention of the Philippines. The future alone will determine the wisdom of that policy. There are, no doubt, good reasons why American sovereignty should not be relinquished at this time; reasons based on principles of Christianity and civilization, and fostered by long-standing presumption against the propriety of alienating national territory. There are many persons, however, whose opinions are worthy of consideration, who believe it the wiser course to grant the Filipinos absolute independence, while others favor a sale of the entire archipelago to some foreign power. As Congress may be called upon to say whether or not the Philippines shall be held permanently, the question of the right to alienate property of the United States becomes very important. A thorough examination of the subject certainly leads to the belief that Congress has the right either to grant the islands independence or to dispose of them by sale. As the United States, as a nation, has an inherent right to acquire territory similar to the inherent right of a person to acquire property, so has it an inherent right to govern or dispose of it. It is a right of sovereignty, just as the right to declare war, make treaties of peace and acquire territory is an attribute of sovereignty. What, then, is the power of Congress over Federal territory? Surely, it has the right to acquire territory and the power to govern it, a power derived from the Constitution, which, Chief-Justice Marshall says, "confers absolutely on the Government of the Union the powers of making war, and making treaties; consequently, the Government possesses the power of ac-

quiring territory either by conquest or by treaty." Justice Story, whose published judicial works evince such profound views of law, says: "As the general Government possesses the right to acquire territory, either by conquest or by treaty, it would seem to follow, as an inevitable consequence, that it possesses the power to govern what it has so acquired."

That the power over territory is vested in Congress without limitation, and that this power has been considered the foundation upon which territorial government rests, was also asserted by Chief-Justice Marshall in McCullough *vs.* Maryland (4 Wheat., 316-422), and in United States *vs.* Gratiot (14 Pet., 526). Justice Brown, in delivering the opinion of the United States Supreme Court in the recent case of Downes *vs.* Bidwell adds:

"So, too, in Mormon Church *vs.* United States, in holding that Congress had power to repeal the charter of the Church, Mr. Justice Bradley used the following forceful language: 'The power of Congress over the Territories of the United States is general and plenary, arising from and incidental to the right to acquire the territory itself, and from the power given by the Constitution to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. It would be absurd to hold that the United States has power to acquire territory, and no power to govern it when acquired. The power to acquire territory, other than the Territory of the Northwest of the Ohio River (which belonged to the United States at the adoption of the Constitution), is derived from the treaty-making power and the power to declare and carry on war. The incidents of these powers are those of national sovereignty and belong to all independent governments. The power to make acquisitions of territory by conquest, by treaty, and by cession, is an incident of national sovereignty.'"

Justice Bradley would have been justified in adding that national sovereignty covers the right to dispose of territory, as well as the right to acquire or govern it. It is as absurd to say that the United States has the right to acquire territory without the right to part with it, as it is to assert that it may acquire but may not govern. There can be no question about the power of Congress to govern Federal territory, for it has been too often upheld by the highest courts to admit of discussion. Only recently the Supreme Court in one of the insular cases remarked: "We are also of opinion that the power to acquire territory by treaty implies not only the power to govern such territory, but to prescribe

upon what terms the United States will receive its inhabitants, and what their status shall be in what Chief-Justice Marshall terms the 'American Empire.'" Justice Brown then discusses the status of the inhabitants of acquired territory; and, after reviewing the treaties providing for the acquisition of Louisiana and Mexico and Florida, in which special provision was made for this subject, concludes that, "in all these cases, there is an implied denial of the right of the inhabitants to American citizenship until Congress, by further action, shall signify its assent thereto."

It must be borne in mind that the Philippines are yet unorganized territory, with the status of the inhabitants undefined by Congress, which has so far refused to extend to the Filipinos the privileges of American citizenship. That Congress cannot cede any part of a State of the Union without the consent of the inhabitants thereof is beyond dispute; but, with its unlimited power over the Territories, Congress may withhold from acquired and unorganized territory any or all the powers of government, as was done with Alaska, Arizona and New Mexico. It may extend privileges to the inhabitants, or deny them all participation in the government. It may delegate its power to the President, as has already been done with respect to both Louisiana and the Philippines. The future status of acquired territory is controlled by the terms of the cession and the will of the new master. Judge Magoon in his Insular Opinions, published two years ago by the War Department, says:

> "The usage of the world is that territory, title to which is acquired by contest and the acquisitions affirmed by treaty of peace, is to be dealt with by the new sovereign according to the terms of the treaty, or, in the absence of treaty stipulations, upon such terms as the new sovereign shall impose. The new sovereign, in the instance with which we have to deal, is the sovereign people of the United States. That sovereign has conferred upon Congress the authority to impose the terms and prescribe the means of accomplishing the purposes of government in all places which its sovereignty attaches, or subject to its jurisdiction, and all property to which it has rights."

The purchase of Louisiana first brought up the question of the legal relations between the States and the newly acquired territories. The Treaty of cession provided that "the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible to the enjoyment

of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States; and, in the meantime, they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion which they profess."

Justice Brown observes that "this evidently committed the Government to the ultimate, but not to the immediate, admission of Louisiana as a State, and postponed its incorporation into the Union to the pleasure of Congress." The United States is not committed to giving the Filipinos immediate or even ultimate Statehood; it is untrammelled by any assurance of future conduct; no promise, express or implied, has been made that the entire archipelago shall not be disposed of to Russia, China or Japan; nor has anything been done which would interfere with the granting of independence, should Congress in its wisdom consider it proper to do so. Congress has reserved to itself the right to dispose of the Philippines, subject only to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution or are implied in its terms.

Section 3, Article IV., of the Constitution says:

"The Congress shall have power *to dispose of* and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice the claims of the United States or of any particular State."

In United States *vs.* Gratiot, the Supreme Court remarks:

"The term 'territory,' as here used, is merely descriptive of one kind of property, and is equivalent to the word 'lands.' And Congress has the same power over it as over any other property belonging to the United States; and this power is vested in Congress without limitation and has been considered the foundation upon which territorial government rests."

Gouverneur Morris, the author of the above-quoted section of the Constitution, writing to Henry W. Livingston, December 4th, 1803, says: "I always thought that, when we should acquire Canada and Louisiana, it would be proper to govern them as provinces, and allow them no voice in our councils. In wording the third section of the fourth article, I went as far as circumstances would permit to establish the exclusion." Having never

received the privileges accorded an organized territory, or been granted voice in our councils, it is evident that the Philippines are already within the exclusion, and are to be considered merely as a piece of property, held subject to the will of the new master, the sovereign people of the United States, who have delegated to Congress full authority to determine what shall be done with the new acquisition. The Supreme Court was aware of this situation when it remarked, in Downes *vs.* Bidwell:

> "Whatever may be finally decided by the American people as to the status of these islands and their inhabitants,—whether they shall be introduced into the sisterhood of States or be permitted to form independent governments,—it does not follow that, in the mean time, awaiting that decision, the people are in the matter of personal rights unprotected by the provisions of our Constitution and subject to the merely arbitrary control of Congress. Even if regarded as aliens, they are entitled under the principles of the Constitution to be protected in life, liberty and property."

The mistake must not be made of confounding personal rights with political rights. It is conceded that the Filipinos are entitled to the protection of this country in all their personal rights. The military forces of the United States have been for several years protecting the Filipinos against the ladrones who infest the islands, they have had their property guarded against the invasion of robbers, and in every way their personal rights have been respected, but without defining their political status or determining the question of their political future. It would seem that nothing more is needed to establish the belief that Congress may alienate the islands than the expression of Justice Brown: "Whatever may be finally decided by the American people as to the status of these islands and their inhabitants,—whether they shall be introduced into the sisterhood of States or *be permitted to form independent governments.*" There can be no doubt that, when this was written, the Supreme Court had in contemplation the authority of Congress to "dispose of" the Philippines in a manner other than by permanent retention. If independence may be granted and American sovereignty relinquished to the inhabitants themselves, what is to hinder a direct alienation of the territory to some foreign power? It would not be the first time that the United States has alienated territory. The Continental Congress, in its instructions to the American peace commission, defined with great

care the boundaries of the United States and the territory claimed by the several States, but was willing to relinquish a part of this territory in the interest of peace. Following upon a description of the boundaries, the instructions said:

"But, notwithstanding the *clear right* of these States, and the importance of the object, yet they are so much influenced by the dictates of religion and humanity, and so desirous of complying with the earnest request of their allies, that, if the line to be drawn from the mouth of Lake Nipissing to the head of the Mississippi cannot be obtained without continuing the war for that purpose, you are hereby empowered to agree to some other line."

A compromise boundary was agreed upon and some of the territory given up, property which by "clear right" belonged to the States. Then followed the Northeastern Boundary dispute, which involved the right of Congress to alienate a part of the sovereign State of Maine, without the consent of its inhabitants. So opposed to the decision of the King of the Netherlands was Maine that Senator Sprague from that State submitted a resolution in the United States Senate, declaring that "the general Government has no constitutional power to cede or transfer to a foreign nation any portion of the territory or inhabitants of any one of the United States without the consent of such State." In debate, he said:

"It is not within the constitutional competency of this Government to assign new boundaries, known to be such, to any one of the States, whether to increase or diminish the quantum of its territory. Our faith is plighted to the State to preserve inviolate the integrity of its soil, and to vindicate the sacredness of the persons of its inhabitants. Maine, as a member of this Union, has a right to require protection from foreign encroachment. No matter whether the extent and numbers invaded be great or small, you cannot permit one acre of her territory or a single individual of her inhabitants to be wrested from her by a foreign grasp."

The only question then involved was as to the consent of the State of Maine, not the consent of that portion of the State which it was proposed to alienate, but of the whole State. It was, of course, through the treaty-making power that these negotiations were conducted, and under this power there is nothing to prevent the President and the State Department from at once formulating a treaty with some foreign Power for the disposition of the Philip-

pines. But to make that treaty valid would require the official approval of Congress, the sanction of the 76,000,000 people of the United States. In the case of Maine, Congress could do nothing, unless Maine first ceded to the general Government the territory in dispute. When it became the property of the general Government, there was no question as to the power of Congress. The history of all boundary negotiations in this country shows that they were conducted on that principle. No one questioned the authority of Congress to "dispose of" territory belonging to the United States. The Northeastern Boundary dispute hung fire for a number of years without final adjustment. Once during the period of negotiations Albert Gallatin wrote to President Monroe from Ghent saying that Great Britain, he thought, would be disposed to offer the whole of Passamaquoddy Bay and the disputed fisheries as an equivalent "for this portion of the northern territory, which they want in order to connect New Brunswick and Quebec. That northern territory is of no importance to us and belongs to the United States and not to Massachusetts, which has not the shadow of a claim to any land north of forty-five degrees to the eastward of the Penobscot River, as you may easily convince yourself of by recurring to her charters."

After failures of conventions and refusal to accept the decision of the King of the Netherlands, Gallatin, in a letter to Charles S. Davies, says: "I believe at the same time that the corner of territory watered by the Restigouche might be yielded without its being a disgraceful concession." At another time, he wrote to a friend: "For my part, I wish that the public lands, now that the resources of the Union are sufficient to meet any exigency, might be so 'disposed of' as to become in fact (as was the case under the colonial system) the patrimony of the poorer classes of society throughout the Union."

The Northeastern Boundary question was finally settled by the Ashburton treaty, and to Daniel Webster, more than any other person, belongs the credit for bringing about a final adjustment of this long-pending dispute. Congress ratified the treaty, but not without some bitter remarks about the cession of important territory to Great Britain. It was alleged that the treaty ceded very important military advantages on this continent to the British Government. Webster was accused "of having unconstitutionally

surrendered a portion of the State of Maine to a foreign Power, and of having accepted a line of boundary between the United States and the British provinces unfavorable to the United States." When he entered the Senate in 1846, he had an opportunity to reply to the charge. He described the troubles of 1839, the border war, the fortified line and the temporary treaty between the Governors of Maine and New Brunswick. He explained that the territory on the side of the United States belonged to no less than four different States, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. How the alienation was begun is shown by his statement that Maine received from the United States Treasury the sum of $150,000 for her share, while altogether the general Government paid $450,000 in cash to the States named for the territory which it subsequently ceded to the British Government. The right to make this treaty was an attribute of sovereignty; and of sovereignty Webster remarks: "To make war, for instance, is an exercise of sovereignty, but the Constitution declares that no State shall make war. To coin money is another exercise of sovereign power; but no State is at liberty to coin money. Again, the Constitution says that no sovereign State shall be so sovereign as to make a treaty." The territory acquired by the United States from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York was, before its cession to Great Britain, merely the property of the nation. Congress, with its power to "dispose of" it, did so by alienating it to the British Government in exchange for certain rights. The consideration could have been gold or land, it was entirely within the discretion of Congress.

The Mexican border has afforded another instance where the United States has been called upon to part with territory. In 1890, Congress adopted a resolution to the following effect:

> "Whereas the Rio Grande is the boundary-line between the United States and Mexico; and whereas in former years annual floods in said river have been such as to change the channel thereof, producing serious avulsions, and oftentimes and in many places leaving large tracts of land belonging to the people of the United States on the Mexican side of the river and Mexican lands on the American side, etc., etc., the President be requested, if, in his opinion, it is not incompatible with the public interests, to enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico with a view to the remedy of all such difficulties as are mentioned."

Colonel Anson Mills, Third Cavalry, retired, is the American member of the joint commission agreed upon by the two countries. Several years have been spent in an examination of the river boundary and the little islands formed by the change of the channel of the river. In one case, 376 acres with eighteen inhabitants were transferred from one country to the other. The Boundary Commission finally agreed upon a plan whereby a new boundary is to be formed and the sovereignty of these islands newly determined. Colonel Mills has recommended the adoption of a treaty for this purpose, and he explains in his report that the United States would gain from Mexico 5,572 acres and would lose 3,292 acres. To make this exchange it is, of course, necessary to alienate the 3,292 acres; and, while Congress has not yet agreed to the treaty, there is no question as to its authority to do so. The same commission is the author of a proposed measure for the construction of an international dam at El Paso, Texas. Mexico claimed to have been injured by the United States depriving her citizens of their vested rights in the water of the Rio Grande, which was used by Americans for irrigation purposes. That the Boundary Commission recognized the authority of Congress to make a direct cession of territory to a foreign Power is shown by Colonel Mills's recommendation to Congress. He explains that the site of the proposed international dam is entirely on American territory, and he recommends that the United States cede to Mexico a small tract of land at a point on the river near El Paso, so that Mexico may own one end and half of the dam and have access to the lake. The commission's report shows that, of the 27,000 acres to be submerged to form the lake, 10,000 acres are in the Territory of New Mexico and 17,000 in the State of Texas. Colonel Mills, apparently, has no concern about the acquisition by the general Government of the land in New Mexico, but as to Texas he says: "Probably the State of Texas would be willing to cede jurisdiction of these lands to the United States."

Bitter opposition to the scheme has developed in Congress, coming from irrigation men in New Mexico, and so far they have prevented action upon the report; but that they do not deny the power of Congress to cede the territory is shown by the following sentence from a statement of counsel for the irrigation company: "Promoters know they could not invade a sovereign State with

such legislation. They depend upon the plenary power of the Federal Government over the Territories."

This, then, brings the discussion right back to the first principle, that Congress in the exercise of general and plenary powers, conferred upon it by the sovereign people of the nation, has full authority to alienate national territory either in this country or in the outlying territorial possessions. It must not be supposed, however, that this power extends to the alienation of territory used by the general Government within a State for a specific purpose, such as government reservations. Such territory is held by the national Government for a specific purpose for the benefit of the national interests; and, when the general Government relinquishes its possession, it must be within the limitations of the laws of the State in which it is located. Another example of this is the acquisition by the general Government of the District of Columbia. This Territory was ceded to the general Government for the purpose of having it used as the seat of government. At one time, it had a territorial form of government; but Congress in 1874 repealed the act creating the Territory, and invested the executive powers of the municipality in three commissioners. All legislative powers were assumed by Congress, and the citizens have no right to vote on national or local questions.

H. A.

II.—IT CANNOT.

Can Congress grant Independence to the Filipinos?

The affirmative answer to this question rests on three propositions: first, an express grant of power by section 3 of Article IV. of the Constitution; second, on the assumption that Congress may exercise the sovereignty of the nation to part with territory, the power to ratify its acquisition being conceded; third, that this power is justified by the precedent of several cases in the past, where territory of the United States has actually been alienated by act of Congress, as cited in the foregoing paper. There does not seem to be any other ground beyond these three; and, if they fail, the power does not exist under the Constitution. The first, if an express grant can be shown, settles the matter, and is therefore of prime importance; the second is a theoretical assumption, of great weight if it can be established; the value of the third depends upon the nature of the precedents and their genuine applica-

bility to the question at issue. I propose to discuss these three propositions in the order of their comparative importance.

First. An express grant by section 3 of Article IV. of the Constitution. It is, perhaps, worth while to note that it is the first article of the Constitution which deals with the nature of the Congress, its duties and its powers, in ten sections; that section 8 is devoted to the enumeration of its powers in eighteen specific grants, and section 9 to seven prohibitions of power, none of which in either section touches directly upon the point at issue. Article II. deals with the "executive power" in four sections; Article III. with the "judicial power" in three sections; then comes Article IV., treating of four separate matters in as many sections; and Articles V., VI. and VII. are all brief, of one section each, not related to the present inquiry.

The first, second and fourth sections of Article IV. have no bearing upon the question. The third in full is as follows:

"1. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed, or erected, within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed, by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.

"2. The Congress shall have power *to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting* the territory, or other property, belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as *to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.*"

Now, let us examine the claim that the power to "dispose of" territory of the United States, granted to Congress by the second clause of the above section, gives it the power to alienate territory. In the first place, the primary meaning of the word "dispose" is not "to part with," but to "set in order," and, specifically, to "set in *right* order," and that is the idea of the word in both the Latin "*disponere*" and the French "*disposer*" from which the English word comes. It is practically the antonym of "to displace" or "to disorder." It is only a secondary usage that comprehends the idea of disposing of a thing or a situation by parting with it, alienating it or giving it up. Intrinsically, it does not mean to sell or get rid of, although inexactly used at times in that sense by confusing the means taken to do a thing with the object in doing it.

Congress may dispose of national territory "*and* make rules and regulations" for so doing; disposing of the fee-simple title in lands owned by selling or giving them to individual citizens, States or corporations, disposing of the government of the inhabitants of such territory, where practicable, by deputing a portion of the national authority to "Territories" organized by act of Congress, to be finally admitted into the Union as new States according to the provisions of the first clause of that section which contains the sole authority of Congress to dispose of them at all. In not one single instance has Congress ever attempted to dispose of territory which was *indisputably* the property of the United States, by alienating it from the national jurisdiction. It has sold and given away *lands* to which it had clear title, but never beyond the sovereignty of the United States. It has made disposition of the government over its Territories, but has invariably retained the national sovereignty. And the fact that its power to do this at all is given by the secondary clause of a section primarily providing for the creation of *new States,* must be held as of the greatest significance. At the time the Constitution was adopted, the only territory to which the provision could be applied was the "Northwest Territory," out of which future States of the Union were to be carved. The section provides for the future creation of such States by Congress, and meantime for the government of the territory. Will any one say that it was for a moment dreamed of that Congress might, by section 3, acquire the power to alienate that territory to Great Britain, France or Spain? If it had been thought such a power had been granted by this provision, can any one suppose the section would have been adopted by the Constitutional Convention, or ratified by the States afterwards? One can imagine the storm that would have been raised by the opponents of the Constitution if such a suggestion had occurred to them, and what a forceful argument it would have placed in their hands. But it was never even thought of. Dispose of the Territory, rule it, regulate it, yes; but alienate it—abandon sovereignty over it? We may be sure that was furthest from the thoughts of the framers of the Constitution.

To carry the matter to its logical conclusion, if Congress possesses the power to alienate the Philippines, to displace them outside of the national jurisdiction, as well as to dispose of them within it, then Congress possesses precisely the same power over

any other territory of the United States, and by simple act of Congress the District of Columbia itself could be ceded to Great Britain,—or Fortress Monroe, or League Island Navy Yard. New Mexico, *with jurisdiction over its inhabitants,* could be ceded to the Sultan of Turkey; or Oklahoma could be ceded to the Mormon Church, to erect there an independent foreign and alien government in the heart of the country. Is that conceivable? Would the Supreme Court ever sustain such a construction of the Constitution as that? Yet it inevitably follows if the power "to dispose of" is held to mean the power to alienate.

Test the question, by supposing that the framers of the Constitution had expressed, in explicit terms, the theory by which it is now sought to construe the phrase they used. Suppose it had been proposed in the Convention over which General Washington presided to make section 3 of Article IV. read: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of the Northwest Territory or other Territories of the United States, to cede them with their inhabitants to any foreign king or potentate, or to permit the erection within their boundaries of governments foreign and alien to the United States." Does any one suppose that such a proposition would have had the ghost of a chance of being adopted, or even considered? Yet it is only expressing plainly what it is now contended that the provision adopted actually means. The question carries its own answer. The Constitution would never have been framed by the Convention with any such provision, to say nothing of subsequent ratification by the States. That may be assumed as a certainty.

Or, if it were now proposed to amend the Constitution by so changing section 3 of Article IV. as to grant a definite and specific power to Congress to cede Oklahoma, New Mexico and other United States territory, with jurisdiction over the inhabitants, to any foreign power, it cannot be believed that any such amendment would be ratified. How, then, can any one think that it was the original intention to grant this power, or that the words actually used can be twisted into such a grant? The suggestion seems incredible, and the authority of Congress in the case of the Philippines rests on precisely the same grounds as its authority over Oklahoma and New Mexico.

If the original Convention never intended to give Congress power to alienate territory, that power never existed under the

Constitution; and if it never existed respecting the Northwest Territory, it does now exist as regards the Philippines, Oklahoma and New Mexico. Can there be any other conclusion?

It is highly important, too, to observe that the prime purport of the whole section is to authorize Congress to erect *new* States of the Union, and to make disposition for the government of its Territories meanwhile, thus confirming the action taken by the Continental Congress in the enactment in 1787 of what is known as the Dane Ordinance for the government of the Northwest Territory, in which it is provided that not less than three nor more than five States should be erected from the territory, and in which it is explicitly ordained that "the said territory, and the States which may be formed therein, shall forever remain a part of this Confederacy of the United States of America." In his exposition of the Constitution, Justice Story applies the principles of the Dane Ordinance in construing the meaning of section 3, Article IV.; and he limits the authority of Congress over this and all territory subsequently acquired to the erection of States within the Union, with the power "to *govern* and *protect*" it meantime. That is his construction of the phrase "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory belonging to the United States"; and there is not a trace of suggestion in his comments that the power to alienate could be construed into it. The power to govern and protect, and ultimately to erect into States of the Union, is the whole of the grant. To alienate is to throw away the power to govern and protect.

In his farewell address, Washington admonishes his countrymen to cherish the Union, "indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest." Is it conceivable that the Convention over which he presided had already, with his approval, incorporated into the Constitution a provision giving Congress the power of alienation, the very suggestion of which he indignantly reprobates? And if the first Congress under the Constitution had passed an act "disposing of" the Northwest Territory, or any part of it, by cession to an alien Power, or granting it independence outside of the United States, it is quite clear that President Washington would have interposed his veto on the ground of the unconstitutionality of such an act, and that he would have been supported by the Supreme Court.

But, even granting that the words "dispose of" in section 3 of Article IV. may mean "to part with by sale or gift," there is a provision in the same clause, which itself prevents sale or gift outside the jurisdiction of the United States, for it specifically provides in the very same sentence as the grant of power that "*nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.*". And what more extreme case of prejudicing the "claims of the United States" to the Philippines, or to Oklahoma or New Mexico, and the interest of each particular State in them, could Congress possibly invent than to abandon those claims altogether and to alienate the territory? The provision is distinct and plain that, in disposing of the Territories, Congress shall have no power to do anything that will prejudice the claims of the United States to sovereignty over them, and any particular State is given the right to have its claim protected as a member of the Union jointly interested with all. If the provision does not mean that, it is difficult to invent a meaning for it.

The conclusion is inevitable, therefore, that no power of Congress to alienate territory was ever intended to be granted by section 3, Article IV., and that it cannot justly be derived from the phraseology used. It therefore cannot exist under that section.

Second. As to the alienation of territory by the exercise of sovereignty upon the part of Congress, the whole case rests upon the validity of the statement that "Congress, in the exercise of general and plenary powers, conferred upon it by the sovereign people of the nation, has full authority to alienate national territory either in this country or in the outlying territorial possessions"; and it will be observed that, under this principle, the admission of the power of Congress to transfer the sovereignty of the United States in the Philippines, either to a foreign government or to an independent organization of the Filipinos themselves, equally carries with it the power of Congress to sell Oklahoma to the German Empire or to Japan, or New Mexico to the Mormon Church; and equally carries with it the power, with the consent of its inhabitants, to declare any State an independent alien Power. If it can do the one, it can do the other. The principle carries with it the deadly germ of national dissolution by act of Congress. If it is sound, it would be entirely possible for a combination of States, having the President and a majority in

Congress—with the consent of their inhabitants and by a simple act of Congress only—to break up the Union, by forming themselves into an independent government.

At the time of the outbreak of our Civil War, it would hardly have been held to be sound doctrine that Mr. Buchanan and the Congress together could have power under the Constitution to legalize the secession of the Southern States; yet, if Congress can constitutionally alienate territory, it can alienate a State with the consent of its inhabitants; and all Mr. Jefferson Davis needed to make his government a valid one under our Constitution, if we admit this principle, was to have an act passed through Congress and signed by Mr. Buchanan transferring the sovereignty of the United States over the seceding States—with the consent of their inhabitants—to the Southern Confederacy. Or, to follow the precedent in the boundary dispute cases, the act might have provided that the Southern States should cede their land to the United States as government "territory," and immediately upon such cession the United States should cede it to the Confederate States of America, and by a very simple but ingenious process the whole transaction would be impregnable under the Constitution, and all cause of dispute avoided. Yet it is inconceivable that such a doctrine would have been sanctioned and such a transaction peacefully consummated. The war would have come just the same, and it would have decided—as it did decide—that the sovereignty of the United States cannot be alienated, or the Union broken up.

The fallacy of the position lies in the assumption that Congress has "general and plenary powers conferred upon it by the sovereign people of the nation," when only *specified* and *limited* powers have been conferred. Indeed, by the tenth amendment to the Constitution the powers of the whole United States itself—in all its branches—were limited to what was expressly granted. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." And, as Justice Story holds:

> "The government of the United States is one of limited powers; and no authority exists beyond the prescribed limits marked out in the instrument itself. Whatever powers are not granted, necessarily belong to the respective States, or to the people of the respective States, if they have not been confided by them to the State Governments."

It would be absurd to hold that because the Congress is composed of "representatives of the people," elected to perform certain legislative duties, and collectively with certain restricted powers, it thereby stands in all things in the place of the "sovereign people" and is vested with the "general and plenary powers" of sovereignty, since the Constitution itself expressly prohibits such a theory. In express terms it prohibits complete sovereignty even to the United States as a whole, and the sovereign powers it does grant are parcelled out definitely and particularly to the various branches of the government, and all others are distinctly reserved. Certain attributes of sovereignty are given to the President alone, as in the case of the pardoning power; certain sovereign powers are granted to the judiciary; certain others to the President and Senate acting together, as the making of treaties and appointments to office; and certain other limited powers to Congress, with a series of distinct exceptions to the grant of sovereign power to that body. Congress, for instance, has the sovereign power of declaring war, but the sovereign power of making peace is in the hands of the President and the Senate. Congress is given the power to naturalize citizens and to admit new States, but it has no power to thrust States out of the Union, nor to expatriate any of its citizens. It has power to acquire new territory, but it has no power to alienate it. It has in many things the power to do, without the power to undo what it has once done. It has always been held that the idea upon which the government of the country was founded is that it should welcome inclusion of the "oppressed peoples" of the world to the benefit of living under its free institutions; the whole spirit is inclusive and not exclusive, and what has once been taken in, whether people or territory, is in for all time and cannot be thrust out. This was certainly the thought and intention of those who framed the Constitution and of those who adopted it; and it was the faith upon which the Civil War was waged by the Government. To exclude is a very different thing from to include, and the power to do one cannot be inferred from the power to do the other. The power to alienate and expatriate is very different from the power to acquire territory and to naturalize citizens. Congress may acquire territory, not in the exercise of any inherent sovereign power of its own, but as a trustee for each and every State in the Union; it is its duty then to govern and protect it, as Justice Story says, but it

has no right to refuse to govern and protect, and hand it over to an alien Power; it has no right to "prejudice any claims . . . . of any particular State," for whom it is trustee. It is impossible to reasonably believe that the framers of the Constitution and the States that adopted it ever intended to confer upon Congress "general and plenary powers"—or the shadow of any power at all—to alienate the Northwest Territory of the United States; and, if not, such power has never been conferred and does not now exist. It can only come into existence by an amendment to the Constitution, which is the only way in which the "sovereign people of the United States,"—"the new sovereign" of the Philippines, as Judge Magoon expresses it in the opinion cited in the previous paper,—can legally confer additional powers upon Congress.

Third. The cases claimed as precedents where Congress alienated United States territory, it will be noted, are all simple settlements of boundary disputes where territory was claimed by the United States as part of its domain, but also claimed by a foreign Power as not being part of the United States. To settle a disputed claim by yielding territory, even if convinced that the disputing Power is in the wrong, is a very different matter from alienating territory which is not in dispute; and the fact that the individual States claiming the land given up were pacified for yielding what they believed their rights, by the payment of various sums of money to transfer any title they may have had to the general Government, which in turn relinquished title to the foreign claimant, thus settling the dispute and removing a *casus belli,* hardly establishes a precedent for the alienation of territory held by undisputed title. The transfer to the foreign claimant was, in effect, an admission that the lands transferred had never rightfully belonged to the United States at all. It is simply the case of a man who says to another: "I believe the lands are mine and you believe they are yours; neither has a perfectly clear title. You take part, and I will take the rest." In the case of the relinquishment to Cuba of the Isle of Pines, there never was an undisputed title to that island, which had always been claimed by the Cuban Government; and Cuba itself was never in any sense United States territory, of course.

But there is no dispute about the title to the Philippines; they were bought and paid for by the money of the people of the

United States, and the people of every "particular State" have just claims to joint ownership, which Congress has no right to "prejudice," much less to give away or abandon. The status is fixed by section 3 of Article IV., and the duty and authority of Congress are simply to dispose of their affairs by making proper rules and regulations for their government and protection, in the future as in the past.

It may be noted, also, that the Treaty of Paris of 1898, by which Spain ceded the Philippines and Porto Rico to the United States, provided that "Spanish subjects, natives of the Peninsula residing in the" ceded territory or in Cuba, may "preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain" by making a declaration within a year, "in default of which declaration they shall be held to have renounced it and to have adopted the nationality of the territory in which they may reside. The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress."

Here is a distinct agreement to absorb into the citizenship of the United States all those Spanish-born inhabitants of the Philippines and Porto Rico who failed, within a year, to renew their allegiance to the Crown of Spain. These have now, *ipso facto,* become citizens of the United States; the native inhabitants of the islands being held still in an unsettled political condition. No doubt, the status of these latter will be satisfactorily established in due course of time; but the sooner they realize, and we too, that the islands are part of the United States permanently, without a chance of their alienation unless they are wrested from us by war, the better it will be for all concerned. As the years go by, the problem will work itself out, and an equitable share in the freedom of our institutions will be acquired by the inhabitants of these islands in increasing measure according to their needs, as it was with the inhabitants of the Northwest Territory and of the Louisiana Purchase.

J. H. C.

THE SON OF ROYAL LANGBRITH.

BY WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS.

PART VIII.

XXXV.

JAMES LANGBRITH took his mother in his arms with an emotion that he had never known before, with pity, with honor, with reverence due to mute suffering, with everything that endears and exalts an object long beloved and wronged. She seemed surprised at his warmth, and sparely kissed him, without even a lax return of his embrace.

"Mother," he said, breaking from the sense of her coldness, and from the subjective pressure of something unwonted in the absolutely unchanged environment, "I came from New York with Uncle John, and he told me about father." As he said this, he noted that the place was lighted only by a hand-lamp, which she was nervously fingering. Her face was swollen as with weeping, and the red crescents under her eyes were tumid with tears unshed.

She said, beginning with the estrayal of his glance toward the lamp, "Norah is not here, and I have let the cook go to bed. I said I would sit up for you. *She* wanted to."

"Thank you," he said, mechanically, to her drooping head. "Uncle John," he repeated, "told me about father." Either she did not understand, or she did not heed; it seemed impossible that she should not have done both; but he felt that it would be cruel to press her farther with the fact of his knowledge now; he took his first lesson in forbearance with her. "I want to see Dr. Anther, at once. Do you suppose he is well enough to see me, to-night?"

"Dr. Anther?" she asked, with an accent that impressed him as having something in it as strange to herself as to him. "Why you can't see him!"

"Yes, I know he is sick; Hope wrote to me. I didn't think—you must excuse— How is he?"

"He is dead," she answered, simply. "He died early this morning. I wanted to stay and sit up, to-night, but they wouldn't let me. They say it isn't the custom, any more. I've just got back here. I brought the trained nurse. She ought to have a little rest before she goes back to Boston." She added one fact to the other

Copyright, 1903, by Harper & Brothers. All Rights Reserved.

in the same quality of tone, with the same effect of not realizing any of them.

"Dead" was all that James Langbrith could say.

"They thought he was getting well, one while; or I did. But Dr. Emering said he was afraid, all along. He had splendid care. That trained nurse is as good as another doctor." With the same lifelessness she said, "I've put you out a little supper; and then I suppose you'll want to go to bed. I don't know as you'll find things very comfortable. I took both the girls with me, and with Norah there still, things haven't been put to rights, all. But I've got your room ready."

She ceased to speak, and they both sat in a silence like that of the night when he found her in the moonlight there after his return to do Hope's bidding, and consent to her marriage with Dr. Anther. Now as then it was as if there was to be no end to their sitting in silence together, but now it ought to be a silence that united not parted them.

Up to a certain moment in every evil predicament men are the victims of it, and after that, if they continue in it they are its agents though as little its masters as before. They are exceptionally happy men if they realize this early enough in life to make choice of their better selves against their worse, and in that choice finally prevail over their evil predicament. The events of James Langbrith's situation presented themselves with the simultaneity with which events are said to show themselves in instants of mortal peril. No detail was missing in the retrospect of wilful arrogance, of blind conceit, of vain folly, of baseless illusion; and yet, with it all, he justly felt that he was not so bad as any of the things he had done. At his age he could not be without hope: there could be as yet no error in life wholly irreparable. His soul seized upon renunciation, sacrifice, as its only refuge, and he said as he thought to himself—but from her response he knew that he must have also said it to his mother—"I must release Hope."

She answered simply, "It's too late, to-night."

"Yes, but I will see her the first thing in the morning, and tell her. That will be the end between us." His mother did not gainsay him, and he asked: "Does she know about it—what my father did to hers?"

His mother said impassively, "I don't believe she does."

"Then I must tell her, and let her take herself back. She would hate me."

His mother looked at him in a daze; she seemed about to speak, but did not. "Mother," his voice quivered in the question, "do you suppose Dr. Anther hated me?"

She took time, as if to consider. "I don't believe he did—after the first—after you went away that day. As far as anything went that he said then, or ever afterwards, he pitied you."

"Oh!" Langbrith groaned.

"I don't know," she resumed, "how much for me it was that he pitied you. He was always wanting you to be told about—about Mr. Langbrith; but he wouldn't force me, when he saw I couldn't. I don't know as I did right not to tell you, but the time never seemed to come."

The words had a sound of excuse, and against this he protested, "Oh, mother!"

"He wanted me," she continued emotionlessly, "to let him tell you, but he always said he wouldn't be my tyrant; he thought I had had enough of tyrants."

Her son winced. "Did he think I had been your tyrant?"

"I guess he did, in some ways. But not that you meant to. He never liked to blame, a great deal." She added, with finality, "He was a good man."

"Yes, yes!" Langbrith wailed in his intolerable regret. "He was a good man. And I insulted and outraged him, when, because he meant the best a man could, and had been your true and constant friend, I should have been on my knees to him. And mother, do you?"

"Do I what?"

"Pity me, too? Forgive me?"

She drew a long, weary sigh. "Oh, what does it all matter?"

"Everything—the whole world, life, death!"

She appeared to consider again. Then she answered, "I don't know as I ever felt but the one way to you. You were my son."

He felt that to rise and kiss her for the assurance of her love, would have been to profane it. He sat where he was, but he burst into a wild sobbing, the tears of a man who does not weep till the fountains of being are broken up. When he controlled himself he asked, "Who else knows about father?"

"Dr. Anther said he told Judge Garley and Mr. Enderby. I shouldn't be surprised if Mrs. Enderby knows too, but I don't believe Mrs. Garley does. Mr. Hawberk did. And your Uncle John. I guess that's all."

"And now, everybody must know! I will begin with Hope."

His mother said nothing to this; it was as if she considered it his affair, in which she had no longer any part. She sat awhile, but not apparently for further speech with him. Then she rose and took her lamp. "I guess I will go to bed, now." She moved absently toward the door. She turned, and came back to light another lamp, which stood ready on a table. "I was leaving you in the dark—"

"I would rather," he broke out. "Don't light it! I can find my way. Good night, mother!"

She looked at him, faltering, and then she stooped and kissed him on the forehead, and left him sitting in the dark. He realized that he was sitting before his father's portrait, and that it had been witness of the scene which had passed. He mutely said to it, "I must begin to undo."

He sat through the night, and in the morning, Norah returning to the house, and letting herself in with a latch-key at the front door, woke him from the drowse he had fallen into, and after his bath, forced him to drink the coffee she had brought him in the dining-room. She was very gentle with him, and he with her, like people sharing the sorrow of the same house of mourning, but beyond the exchange of a few questions and answers about his voyage home, they did not speak till he said, "What did my mother mean, Norah, about having just got back here? Has she been out of the house?"

"And didn't she tell you? We all been up at the doctor's keepin' house there, and doin' for him, me and Mary and your mother, ever since it was sure he was goin' to be bad. I thought some one would be writin' to you!"

"No," Langbrith answered, briefly.

"Miss Hope was with us, too, some of the time, and Mrs. Enderby. But it was all no use, as far as the doctor went. He didn't know one from another, after the first day or two. Mary has got ye some rice cakes, Mr. James. Won't ye have anny?"

Langbrith was pushing back his chair. "No, I don't want anything more, Norah. I'll be back before long, tell my mother, when she comes down."

"And I hope then she won't come down soon, if she's sleeping. It's more than she's done for the last week."

He went away with the trivial sense of Norah's Yankee correctness in her Irish parlance, which he did not remember to have noted before, and he had no question of going directly to find Hope at eight o'clock in the morning.

She was waiting for him, even then, though it could not be said that she was expecting him. He had figured holding himself from her out of duty to her, but they were in each other's arms before he could help it. In that mutual transport, and while he still pressed her close to him, she divined his constraint, and asked, vividly, "What is the matter?"

"I want to tell you, but I don't know how he began."

"Well, don't *mind* now," she said, with the first gleam of her inextinguishable gayety. "Do it anyhow," she added, "there isn't anything I can't bear now—now *you're* here."

"Oh, Hope, dearest!"

"Is it something dreadful? Something about *us?*"

"It's about your father," she pulled herself away, he felt indignantly, "and mine. I should think I was dreaming, but I know I'm awake for the first time in my life. Every one must know the truth, but I must begin with you."

"What do you mean, James Langbrith?" she demanded, severely; and he found the strength of despair.

"My father was not what I believed. He was a man that—that—wronged every one he had to do with. He wronged your father so cruelly that he drove him to the opium."

"*Your* father? *Mine?* Why, you must be crazy!"

"If you say that you will make me so. But I am perfectly sane at last. Uncle John told me about it yesterday coming up from New York, and I've come the first thing this morning to tell you. I told mother last night that I was coming to release you, and to give back all that my father had stolen—stolen!—from yours. It makes me feel as if I had stolen you."

"Now, James Langbrith," she broke out upon him from her bewilderment, "you just stop being silly, and tell me exactly what you're talking about." She took his hand, and pulled it vehemently while she fixed him with her eyes.

He began again, and now he told her the greater part of the story that John Langbrith had vindictively poured out upon him. He could not bring himself to speak of his father's hidden life; the innocent shame that was between them forbade that; but somehow he possessed her of all else that he knew, while she kept clutching his hand convulsively, and pulling herself to him. "This has been my home-coming. I—didn't sleep last night, and I'm rather broken up, or else I could have prepared you—"

"Oh, you poor thing!" she put forward her left hand and passed it over his reeking forehead, as if he were her child, in the divine mother-pity which is in a woman's heart even for her husband or her lover. "You are the injured one, kept in the dark so, all your life."

He tried to resist her compassion, but his head fell upon her breast. "It had to be so. And now," he said, "the most I can do, is to make restitution of what you have been robbed of, and give you back yourself."

"Oh, how ridiculous!" she said, with a bewitching inadequacy, while she smoothed his hair with her hand. "Do you suppose father would want *you* to do that? And I won't have myself back, as you call it! What would I do with myself, if I had it?" she added. "Now you be still, and let *me* talk awhile. I don't believe it's as bad as your Uncle John says, and if it is, it don't make any difference now. It's all past and gone, isn't it? I guess father got the fun out of his inventions, even if somebody else got the money. He was so happy this last year that it would have made up for anything. I do believe that he couldn't have enjoyed it so much if it hadn't been for what went before. He never said a word to me to show that he felt injured, and he liked *you,* James; he was proud of you, and he believed in what you were trying to do, over there, even when I couldn't, always. Father was a genius, *I* think. Don't you?"

"Yes—"

"Well, then, he had his good time as it went along. He took it with him, as you may say. And as far as I'm concerned, and that restitution of me that you talk about, I guess we'll just have me in the family."

If his despair had been what he thought it, he could not have resisted her sweetness, her greatness; he could not have denied himself the pardon and the blessing it assured him. But he could not speak, and a little hurt at his silence stole into her drolling voice.

"Still, if you don't want me—"

"Oh, my dearest!" he cried out. "What are you saying?" and once more they took each other into a long embrace that said everything which they had both vainly tried to put into words. When they were so far parted that he could look into her eyes, he said, "How strange you are, Hope!"

"Am I? Well, that's what Dr. Anther used to insinuate, so it's a compliment that I'm used to. He seemed to think it was all right, even if you don't."

"I? Oh, Hope!"

"Well, *some* people, then. If they were in your place, they would say that it was very queer I shouldn't act more as if I felt father's going. And we haven't spoken of it; poor father! What would you say if I said sometimes I was glad of it? He was well when he went, and he hadn't touched a drop of laudanum for months and months. But I never felt sure about it, and I don't believe Dr. Anther did, and when I think how he used to suffer—well!" She was one of the women who rain and shine together, and now the tears fell over her pathetic smile.

"I know," he gulped.

"Sometime I'll tell you all about him, but not now. And I'll tell you about Dr. Anther. He was the best man that ever lived. Are you glad that you went home that night and took it back, with your mother?"

"It's what gives me the only courage I have left."

"Well, I'd rather hear you say that than that *I* gave you courage," she said; but he could see that she was a little jealous of the help of even a good conscience, and he answered, "You're my Hope."

She laughed into a sob, and then laughed out of it. "Then you must be equal to seeing grandmother. Come in and speak with her."

They had been sitting in the dim little parlor, and now Hope led him into the dining-room, where Mrs. Southfield was grimly chastising the breakfast-table for the disorder in which Hope had left it, when she flew to let Langbrith in at the front door. She paused with a plate in her hand, and transferred her fierceness to Langbrith's face. "Here's James, grandmother," said Hope, recklessly. "Can't you stop and shake hands with him?"

"I don't know," the old woman said, "as I want to shake hands with any of his tribe."

"Not when he's going to be one of *our* tribe, grandmother? That's what he says he is."

"I wouldn't trust anything a Langbrith says," Mrs. Southfield returned, with impartiality.

"Well, then, it's what I say, too. Just shake hands, anyway," Hope bade her cheerfully, and after her grandmother had wiped her hand on her apron and given it to Langbrith, the girl pursued, "Well, now, that's settled," and when she had drawn him out of the room again by the hand that was still finding itself in his, she suddenly asked him "Did you like it?" and at his stare, she added, "The way grandmother welcomed you?"

"It was what I deserved," he answered, stonily.

"No, it wasn't, but it's what you'll get if you tell everybody about your father. "Will you do it? Can you?"

"I *will*, whether I can or not."

"I don't like that hard look in your face," she said, with a criticism that seemed general rather than special, then, with special application, she said, "It makes me afraid of you. I wonder if you'll be stubborn."

"Don't you want me to be firm in the right?"

"Yes," she sighed, "if you know what the right is."

He looked at her, perplexed. "Have you told any one else? Or no, you said you wanted to tell me first. Are you going to tell other people right away?"

"Can it be known too soon?" he demanded, gloomily. "I should like to stand by Dr. Anther's open grave and proclaim it, and take my father's shame on me before them all."

She only said, "Oh!" with so little liking for the imaginary spectacle that he had to brace himself for the effort of going on.

"That tablet must come down out of the library as publicly as I put it there. I must tell the whole community the facts of my father's life, so far as they can be decently known. I must own the wrongs he did, and ask any man who has a grievance against him to come forward and let me right him so far as I can."

"It sounds like a play, doesn't it?" she said, with a smile that was somehow loving as well as mocking. "Anybody can see that you will know how to write plays." At sight of the dismay in his face, she turned wholly serious. "James, you are crazy! Don't you see that it wouldn't do?"

"Why not?" he faltered.

"Because it is too late! You would just disgrace yourself and not help anybody. It would make the greatest scandal! And what good would it do?"

"That is not the question?"

"Yes it is, James, and if we are going to bear this together—"

"What have you to do with it?"

"Well, if I don't *take myself back*, I should say I had full as much to do with it as you!"

He stood daunted by what had not occurred to him before, and he could not answer her anything.

"Now do you understand?" she triumphed, tenderly. "I guess if it was my father that suffered the most I have the right to say the

most; and I don't believe I should like to have everybody know the kind of family I was marrying into. Why, if grandmother treats you the way she does because she felt it in her bones about your father, what would she do when all the neighbors knew it, and it got into the papers? Think what Jessamy Colebridge would say; and Susie Johns!"

He knew that she was entreating him lovingly as well as mockingly, and though it was sweet, yet he could not make sure of the reality of what was so opposite to the picture he had carried night-long in his mind of her instantly agreeing with him, and supporting him in the ordeal he proposed to himself, in the event of her refusing his renunciation. "I don't understand you, Hope," he hesitated.

"Yes, you do, James Langbrith!" she retorted. "You see that I've got just as much to do with this as you have. Don't you suppose," she softly reproached him, "that I know how you feel, and how proud I am of you for it? But I'm not sure about it—I'm not sure it's right; and I'm not going to let you do it on your own responsibility, if I have any say in it. And I have, haven't I?"

"Why, surely! If I hadn't been so blindly selfish, I should have seen that without your telling me."

"I will settle it about your selfishness some other time. It's *my* selfishness now. This is something we can't decide between us. Do you know what I was just thinking?"

"Yes," he huskily responded. "That we could leave it to Dr. Anther."

"Yes!" she said, solemnly. "I am glad you knew. Who else is there?"

"My mother—"

"We mustn't put anything on her. But she had a right that you should think of her. Well?"

"Uncle John would be of no use."

"No."

"Judge Garley?"

"Of course you don't mean it. He is a good man, but he would just laugh at us. Why are we beating about the bush so? We must go to Dr. Enderby!"

"Yes, I really thought of him next, when I remembered that Dr. Anther—"

"I knew you did. Well, we ought to go to him at once. Don't let us hesitate. Wait till I get my hat."

She went up the cramped stairs, apparently into that chamber out of which he had once heard the nightmare groans of her father coming, and before she returned he heard her open some door down-stairs, and call cheerfully through it, "Don't you wash the dishes, grandma. I'll be back soon," and she joined him with her face freshened and brightened by the bathing-away of her tears.

Her quick tilting was swifter than his long striding as they descended the hillside path towards the rectory, and she chanted to Mrs. Enderby among the autumn flowers beyond the fence with a gayety that she could not quite keep out of her voice, "How d'ye do, Mrs. Enderby! Is Dr. Enderby at home?"

XXXVI.

The two young people were upon Mrs. Enderby before she could drop her garden shears, and dismiss from her consciousness a prescience of their coming for a purpose she had long associated with them, and replace it with a decorous sense of all there was in the circumstances of their lives to banish that from them for the time. She was smiling too radiantly upon Langbrith, she felt, even when she had effected the substitution, but she could not help it. She could only make an apposite reflection on the strangeness of life, as she asked him about himself, and about his mother, and formulated some just observations on the sad home-coming this must be for him in the losses which he shared with them all. Then she said, "The doctor is in his study. Won't you go in?" and offered to remain outside, but Hope said—

"We want you, too, Mrs. Enderby. It's something that we want you both to talk with us about; don't we, James?" she ended, with a deference to him which seemed to Mrs. Enderby very pretty.

"He is trying to write his sermon—for to-morrow, you know," she explained more directly toward Hope; but it was now Langbrith who answered.

"If it is the funeral sermon, what we may have to say will be fit, perhaps."

"Oh, he will not mind being interrupted by you, in any case," she said, with her mind playing mechanically away from the occasion to the duty she had of always sequestering the rector when he was writing.

After the greeting to Hope, and the formalities with himself, Langbrith took the word with a dignity and composure that Mrs. Enderby saw kindle the girl's eyes with pride in him.

"I was saying to Mrs. Enderby that I hoped our errand wouldn't be out of keeping with the subject of your sermon, if you are writing about Dr. Anther. He knew something—something of my—family history which never came to me till yesterday. My ignorance of it was the means of a cruel misconception on my part, and of most generous forbearance on his; and it is a question now of what can be done in reparation from me,—the sort and measure of it."

Langbrith paused, and the rector sat kindly interpreting the young man's thoughts by the light of his previous knowledge. But it was not for him to forestall the confidence which he felt was about to be offered to him. He merely said, "I could hardly imagine

anything you could tell me that would heighten my sense of Dr. Anther's worth."

"Yes, I know that," the young man assented, with a humility, which made the other accuse himself of having not been quite clear. "But before I speak of him, I ought to say that I owe *you* some reparation. When I asked you to say some words at the dedication of the tablet to my father, I didn't know that my father —that my father—" He choked. He had easily told Hope, not only because, as she had made him realize, that it was as essentially her affair as his, but because also there was something in the confession of his father's iniquity to one so supremely concerned which supported him; but his heart sank with a sense of the common shame awaiting him from the common knowledge, as it intimated itself to him from even such pity as Dr. Enderby's. He perceived that it was not the victims of his father's misdeeds whom he feared, but the witnesses of these whom his confession would create. Instinctively, he looked toward Hope for help, but she dropped her face, and at the pathos of this Mrs. Enderby addressed a murmur of appeal to her husband.

Probably he saw no reason for putting Langbrith to the ordeal he shrank from, and he said, "You needn't go on! I think I know what you want to say. I did not know it when you asked me to speak those words, but I knew it before I spoke them—from Dr. Anther."

Langbrith fetched a sigh of relief that was almost a groan. "I won't say," the rector continued, "what I might have done if I had known it all when you asked me, for I am no longer master of such a situation, and I can't go back to it and recreate it. But I was informed in time to refuse a part in that ceremony, and I did not, for reasons that still seem to me good."

Langbrith passed his right hand over his forehead, and was aware of having Hope's hand in his left as he did so. "Would you mind," he huskily asked, "telling me your reasons."

"They are not very profound. They related less to myself than to the effect of my refusal with the public—of the ultimate effect, if the cause of my refusal became, we will say, notorious. I had not much time to give to the matter, but I find that I don't think differently now, upon further reflection. It seemed to me that no good and much harm could come of revealing the past; that so far as your father was concerned, we had no right to enter into judgment, and that so far as God's purposes were concerned, we had no right to act upon our conception of what they might be in such a case. Do I make myself understood?"

"Yes," Langbrith whispered.

"I believe that I said to Dr. Anther—in fact, I am sure I did—that to take upon ourselves any agency for supposed justice—for the discovery and the retribution implied by the concealment and the wrong in the case, would be in a manner forcing God's pur-

poses; I don't like the phrase, now; but it expressed my meaning. May I ask how the matter has become known to you?"

"My Uncle John told me yesterday, as we were coming up from New York. We have had a difference about—the business, and I am afraid I—I affronted him; and—and he told me."

"In anger?"

"Yes, in anger."

The rector thought how it was written, "Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee." It seemed to him that the Divine Providence had not acted inopportunely; and he was contented with the mode in which the young man had learned the worst; it was better that he should have come by the knowledge of it so than by any deliberate revelation, with such effect of authority as an officious interference could have arrogated to itself. His mother could not have told him, and she could not suffer Dr. Anther to tell him. But his father's brother might tell him, in anger and in hate, even, and out of his evil passions, and the evil passions they would arouse in the young man, evoke the best result possible from the otherwise hopeless case.

Langbrith waited for him to speak; then he said: "And what do you think I ought to do now?"

"Oh, I beg your pardon! What had you thought of doing?"

"Of making it all known; of undoing my father's wrong as far as I could, and of revoking my own acts in perpetuating his good name—the good name he has falsely borne in this community."

"That is natural—for you, and you will let me say that it does you honor. But— What do you think, Hope?"

"I think he oughtn't to do any such thing."

"Why?"

"Because I don't see what good it would do. And it would make a great deal of misery for nothing. I know that the Bible says things have got to come out, but it doesn't say that they need come out *here*, when there's nobody left to suffer for them except those that didn't do them."

"What do you say, my dear?" The rector turned his head towards Mrs. Enderby.

"I say what Hope does," Mrs. Enderby's eyes shone with admiration of the girl, as she smiled on her.

"And I suppose there can be no doubt of your mother's wish?" he asked Langbrith.

"I am afraid," said the young man sadly, "I hadn't considered her. I'm afraid that I have never considered her."

The rector sat in a muse which he was some time in breaking. "If it is something that you feel is for the good of your own soul," he spoke solemnly, "I could adjure you to speak out, and make confession of your father's sins."

"I was trying," said Langbrith, "not to think of my own good." He looked at Hope, but she would not meet his glance.

"Then," said the rector, "though I know that it would be a relief to you to have all this known, and to take upon yourself the dishonor which the stupid and malignant love to visit upon the children of wrong-doers, I think you must not seek that relief. I would impose a more difficult, a heavier penance. I would bid you keep all this to yourself, as your mother has kept it to herself, and as your wife—excuse me, I didn't realize—"

"Oh, that is all right, Dr. Enderby!" Hope quaintly condoned his break.

"And as your wife," the rector resumed with fresh courage, "wishes you to keep it. I know that from my talks with Dr. Anther, this was finally his mind in regard to the matter, and he told me this was finally, or indeed, long ago, the mind of Hope's father. Yes, you must keep this secret locked in your own heart, until such time as the Infinite Mercy, which is the Infinite Justice, shall choose to free you of it. You will know the will of God when, if ever in this world, there is some event which may well seem a chance, leading to the discovery of what you have kept hid. Then you must own the truth promptly and fully. I believe in your good-will, and in your love of the truth, and I know that God will give you strength to do His purpose when He bids you."

XXXVII.

At Anther's grave, Enderby kept himself to the ritual of his church, and disappointed many who thought he would make some remarks, as they phrased it, on the dead man's life, more final than anything he had said in his sermon the day before. There was some disappointment with the sermon itself, which the rector shared, for in his reluctance to make it the mere personal praise of his friend, he was aware of having kept it too general. He would have agreed, if he could from his own knowledge, with those who said it was the least moving of the discourses of the day which had all dealt with Anther's character and career. At the Orthodox Church, the Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, and the Universalist Church, the qualities of the man who had now become a memory were dealt with directly, and his example interpreted as a lesson to those who heard. But Enderby shrank from eulogy, and while he knew that he was failing the expectations of his hearers, he had the consolation, such as it was, of knowing that he was dealing with Anther's memory as Anther would have had him if it had been his to choose. Even this consolation was alloyed by the consciousness that it was no more for Anther to choose being made little of than to choose being made much of, and that in deferring to an imaginable preference of the man, he was possibly as greatly in error as if he had pronounced the warmest and fullest panegyric of his virtues.

He could only say to himself that he had done what he could,

when he feared, from the effect, that he had not done enough. He was curiously disabled by the personal considerations of the case, not only as concerned Anther himself, but as concerned Langbrith and his mother. In the friendship beginning tardily, but growing rapidly into something vitally strong between them, Anther had told the preacher of all that had passed with either of these and himself. He spoke of the affair as if it were a great while ago, and with a certain aloofness in which he judged himself as impartially as the others. From being the man in later middle life who had wished to form the happiness of a woman long dear to him, he had suddenly lapsed into an elderly man to whom it was appreciable that he could not have made her happy, but only more miserable, if he had pressed her to obey the prompting of her own affection for him. He had come to see that in a case where nothing was wrong, where everything was right, there were yet obstacles which could not be removed without a violence leaving a bruise destined to be lastingly sensitive. In his confidences to the man who understood him, he not only excused James Langbrith's part in the matter, as something natural and inevitable, but his tolerance retroacted toward the boy's father, and he accounted for Royal Langbrith with a scientific largeness in which Enderby could not join him. He seemed to have exhausted the hoarded abhorrence with which he had hitherto visited the sinner's memory, and to regard his evil life as a morbid condition with which the psychological side of pathology rather than morals had to do. He regarded him, apparently, with no more resentment than some treacherous and cruel beast whose propensities imply its prey, and which has satisfied them with a moral responsibility difficult or impossible for our ethics to adjust. In these speculations, Royal Langbrith seemed for him a part of the vast sum of evil, not personally detachable and punishable. As for that publicity which his revolted instincts had long demanded for Langbrith's sins he divined that it would have been the wildest and wantonest of errors. He cited the attitude of Hawberk toward the memory of his pitiless enemy. Hawberk once said that he guessed Royal Langbrith was built that way, and that it was too late to give him a realizing sense that there was anything out of order in his machinery. Hawberk said he had no wish to make anybody else suffer for what Royal, as he called him, had done. He doubted whether if Royal himself were on hand he would want to collect anything from Royal out of his pocket or out of his hide. He guessed his claims were outlawed.

Anther himself more than once approved the position which Enderby had taken in regard to the public celebration of Langbrith's public munificence, but in this he did not allay the disquiet of the rector's own mind concerning it. In this Enderby insisted that he had done no better than choose the least of the evils presented, and that somehow, some day, it behooved him to own

the compromise made with his conscience. He did not see the way nor the hour, but he hoped that he was holding himself in readiness.

Early in the winter, the one vindictive foe of Royal Langbrith's memory perished in Mrs. Southfield, who had, indeed, only a conjectured, or as she believed, an inspired grievance. Such as it was she wished to visit it on the sinner's son rather than the sinner himself. Royal Langbrith had necessarily lapsed beyond her active hostility, and she turned this upon James Langbrith whose engagement to Hope she never ceased to oppose. Hope herself took the humorous view of her grandmother's opposition, as she had taken the humorous view of her father's long tragedy, not because it was not real and terrible, but because temperamentally she had no other way of bearing it, because in that way she could transmute it into something fantastic, and smile at what otherwise must have broken her heart. She did not try to reconcile her grandmother to what her grandmother held her weak recreancy, but she reconciled herself to her grandmother, and assented and coaxed and had her way, and kept Langbrith from offering his antagonist a vain and exasperating propitiation. Mrs. Southfield's antagonism endured to the end. On her death-bed she left Hope a hoarsely whispered warning against the Langbrith tribe, as her last charge. She might be said to have died of her vivid sense of a vague and unavenged injury, but her injury died with her, and with her died the sole reason against Hope's marriage.

There were people who contended for the fact of an unbecoming haste in her marriage, but these in their censure made no provision for the life of the girl, otherwise left absolutely alone in the world. Mrs. Enderby led the party against them, and with the support of Mrs. Garley, and their respective husbands, declared that Hope should not observe a vain decorum in waiting for a certain period of mourning to pass. She was married from the rectory, which Mrs. Enderby had made her make her home three months after her father's death, and something less than three weeks after her grandmother's, and she went at Christmas to live with her husband in his father's house. Mrs. Enderby would have liked to infer a mystical significance from the coincidence of the event with the sacred time, when peace on earth and good-will was prophesied in every sort. If Dr. Enderby had been still a Unitarian, she would have openly done so, but under the circumstances she was not sure how far she might loose her imagination without compromising some doctrinal position of his, or committing him to what he might have felt a sentimental fancy. She confined herself to suggesting the notion to him, and contented herself with his assent that they might tacitly draw what comfort they could from the notion.

She did not feel it right to share it with Hope, but she permitted herself to share fully with the girl the promise of her new happi-

ness. There was no question of primacy in the house where Hope went to live between the elder and the younger Mrs. Langbrith. People are modified rather than essentially changed, and it would be fatuous to pretend that James Langbrith was not irked in his love of fitnesses by his wife's continuing in certain things her relation of guest to the house where she was really mistress. She left her mother-in-law the head of the table, and the poor woman whose life had always been in such an abeyance seemed to satisfy an instinct of dominance, never gratified before, in this shadowy superiority. The two worked equally together in other things of the house, and there was no change except a turning, so gradual as to be almost imperceptible, of the old Norah and of Mary, the cook, to the younger Mrs. Langbrith for instructions.

The change did not awaken any apparent jealousy in the passive nature of the older woman, whose bearing toward her son betrayed no trace of the past conflict, of her weak will with his strong will. At times, when he feared himself to have been almost obviously impatient with her illusory headship, or when Hope interpreted his restiveness to him in that sense and blamed it, he sought little occasions of reparation. But these seemed to afflict her, and Hope had to warn him against being apparently other than he had always been to her. He had to bear with that as he had to bear with another trial, which was less real. He had imagined removing his father's portrait from its place over the library mantel, but when he intimated his wish to Hope she vehemently forbade it. That, she said, was no more to be thought of, without the leading that Dr. Enderby had insisted upon as Langbrith's rule of action, than the removal of the commemorative tablet from the front of the town library. They must both stay till the providential time came.

As a matter of fact that time has never come. The evil life of Royal Langbrith remains as he hid it, except for the few contemporary and subsequent witnesses of it. To the rest of the community nothing is known; but as happens with men sometimes, of whom nothing is known, there has grown up in the public mind a certain conjecture of discredit. This may have sprung from chance expressions of Mrs. Southfield, in her theoretical distrust of the whole Langbrith tribe; she could not always be silent before people; but what is certain is that from the moment of the dedication of the votive tablet by the son, the myth of the father suffered a kind of discoloration not to say obscuration. Nobody could then say whether he was really the saint and sage that he was reputed, and of what nobody can say, the contrary can be affirmed without contention, with even some honor to the shrewd conjecture of those who affirm it.

The silence of Royal Langbrith's widow continued as unbroken as that of Anther in his grave. It was so inveterately the habit of her life that she never betrayed herself to Hope, and what passed be-

tween her and her son was as if it had never passed. The whole incident of her proposed marriage with the man who was so truly her friend was without trace in her actual relation to her son. It may be that the forces of her nature exhausted themselves in the struggle to accomplish her happiness, or it may be that her happiness was never essentially involved, and that she submitted to her fate without the suffering which Mrs. Enderby preferred to imagine of her. She never spoke of Anther, and whether she ever thought of him in the tender reverence which was his due, Mrs. Enderby could not decide. Sometimes she was intolerably vexed with Mrs. Langbrith, sometimes she was resigned to the submission in which she saw the life of Mrs. Langbrith passing. That, when she came to think of it, was not without its dignity; and it was not what Anther himself, she realized, would have had changed into a futile rebellion. She realized, in her most vehement emotion that there were women who had been long happily married, and who when widowed lived on in the same silence concerning the happiness they had lost as Mrs. Langbrith kept concerning the happiness she never knew.

Whether she duly enjoyed the happiness of her son in his wife was another question which vexed the kindly witness; but she saw that at least Mrs. Langbrith lived in harmony with them, and that a quiet pervaded the whole household which might very well pass for peace. After a certain period, which John Langbrith himself fixed for the instruction of his nephew in the business of the mills, James Langbrith took charge of them, and released his uncle to that voyage round the world in whose course he was to lose his dyspepsia, perhaps with that equatorial day which lapses from the circumnavigator's calendar. He lost the day, if not the dyspepsia, and he returned with strength sufficiently renewed to bear it, which is probably the only real form of cure known to suffering. He then offered to let his nephew go back to Paris, if he wished, and resume his dramaturgical studies. There had been no explicit reconciliation between them, but a better reciprocal knowledge had done the effect of this, and it was with a respect for his nephew's ambition which he had not felt before that John Langbrith proposed to take up his job again in its entirety. The younger man did not respond directly. He asked his uncle, who had stopped in Paris on his way home, how Falk seemed to be getting on, and John Langbrith said Falk seemed to be doing well, and was at any rate working like a beaver; he had made a study of this fact, for he knew that James was paying his friend's way, and he did not want him to waste his money. He was not a judge of painting, but he was a judge of working, and Falk was working.

James Langbrith asked, "Did you have any talk with him about me?"

"Yes, I did," the uncle said, more promptly than willingly.

"What did he say?"

"Well, he said he would like to have you back, but—"

"Well?"

"If you really meant business, you could write plays in Saxmills as well as in Paris. You could get it out of you, anywhere, if you had it in you."

James Langbrith did not ask if Falk had said anything of Susie Johns; he knew from Hope that their affair had been one of those without seriousness on either side, which pass with our young people in frequent succession, failing to eventuate in the matrimony which would be otherwise universal among us,—without attaching blame to either side. There was something else that interested the young man infinitely more in the things that his uncle volunteered to tell him. John Langbrith with greater reluctance than could have been predicated of him, either by himself or others, approached a fact which he said James ought to know, and when, without further preamble, he came out with it, his nephew agreed with him. One day at his hotel in Paris, he had received the visit of a lady who seemed at first disposed to make a mystery of herself. She was the widow, she said of a gentleman who had so far deceived her in marriage as not to have left her, at his death, so well provided for as she had expected, and she bore more heavily upon his want of candor in this respect than her own in another, though she was presently obliged to be entirely frank with John Langbrith. She was, it then appeared, the mother of that other family of his brother, who had provided for her so well that she was able to figure as a widow in easy circumstances when contracting her subsequent marriage. But her money had gone in the speculations which her husband was always engaging in for the increase of his fortune, and if her children had not been nearly all provided for in successful marriages, she would not have known what to do. She did not know what to do now, in the case of the daughter whom she had with her in Paris for the cultivation of her voice with a view to the operatic stage. She had, as she said, kept track of Mr. Langbrith's family, and she had heard that he left a son by another marriage—as she said; for in the retrospect she preferred to treat Royal Langbrith's relation to her as bigamous —very comfortably off. Without actually putting it she left with John Langbrith the question whether this son might not like to do something for his sister, and without actually putting it, John Langbrith now left the question with his nephew.

After a moment, James Langbrith asked, with a sickened face, "Did you see the girl?"

"Yes, I did."

"What sort of girl was she?"

"About the sort her mother was, I guess, at her age. Why not?"

"Did you hear her sing?"

"She can sing all right, I guess. Maybe that'll keep her straight. Any rate, it don't seem to matter so much in that line of life."

"Yes," James Langbrith assented from the dark, unwilling knowledge of the theatre which in the line of his ambition had revolted

more than it had ever interested him. He added, "I will speak to Hope," and John Langbrith being apparently as sick of the subject as himself, they dropped it.

James Langbrith took it up again that night with his wife, recurring to the general fact in his father's history with the shrinking which he did not understand her not understanding. When he had got the fact before her, "What ought I to do?" he asked, with a frown of disgust, as at some loathsome sight.

"You ought to tell your mother, in the first place," Hope said, and he answered with still stronger repulsion:

"I don't see how I can."

"No," she assented. "I guess I shall have to do it for you," and Langbrith perhaps never felt so deeply her goodness and greatness as in this. With her wifely instinct, and the motherly instinct which was prophesying in her heart, she made known the fact to that virginal nature, which never otherwise approached it. Mrs. Langbrith perhaps never fully realized the relation that established itself between her son and his father's past in his assumption of his father's case responsibility, but Langbrith did so to the last fibre of his being. He needlessly stipulated with those people, as he always characterized them in his thought, that the recognition of the tie acknowledged was to be absolutely tacit; they had really no more wish to have it known than he; but at the bottom of Hope's heart there was what must be called a curiosity concerning her half-sister-in-law which she did not venture to own till she had Langbrith at a disadvantage where he was helpless. It was when they hung together one night over the cradle of their first-born, and felt the holiness of her innocence purify their hearts, that she said, dreamily, "If she were the child of people who had done wrong, I suppose she would be just as pure and sweet."

"What do you mean, Hope!" he cried, and she told him how she often thought of that girl, and how she longed to know what she was like, or what she looked like.

"Hope," he asked, "have you ever told Mrs. Enderby?"

"Indeed, I haven't!" she said, and then, woundedly, she asked, "Do you think I would speak of it without your knowing?"

"No, and I beg your pardon. I will ask the woman to send her picture."

But when the picture came, with the girl in the pose of the first part that had been given her in comic opera at Milan, which it had been her pride or her mother's to perpetuate in photography, Hope first gave the laugh that had so often defended her against the trials of life, and then prepared to break the blow to her husband.

He only glanced at the picture and said, without offering to take it from her, "We must keep on with the allowance," as if it had been in his mind instantly to withdraw it. He never asked her what she did with the picture, but when she had put it definitely away she remained with a longing to laugh herself over with somebody,

in view of this over-satiation of her curiosity. She resisted her impulse to such a confidence with Mrs. Enderby not only because she was bound in honor against it, but because she did not believe Mrs. Enderby could enter perfectly into the spirit of the affair.

The wife of the rector, and through her the rector himself, continued in that patience with providence which those more intimately concerned were obliged to practise in a situation of apparently indefinite duration. Enderby's patience was more tacit than that of Mrs. Enderby, with whom it often took the form of inquiry whether he thought there would ever be any revelation of the secrets of Royal Langbrith's life. She alleged that passage of scripture, to which she had recurred from the beginning of her own privity. "There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; and hid that shall not be known," and required him to reconcile it with the case in hand; and it is doubtful if she was fully satisfied with his suggestion that this did not finally or primarily refer to an earthly knowledge of the thing. Women, possibly, cannot imagine as men can the duration of human events as from everlasting to everlasting; time seems long enough to them for the accomplishment of the effects that flow from causes here below; and it appears a defect of the machinery, when we do not arrive at the results implied by the occasions of them. Their nature demands of the moral government of the universe a logical exactitude which their own words and acts seldom embody.

Enderby was loth to put his wife off with the only answer he could make, and to say that in the spiritual continuity of existence, eternity was not too far a term for the judgment of offences. He did not suffer with her at the hold which a bad man's life had kept after his death on those who survived him, and he reasoned in vain that good, evidently, and not evil, had come to others from leaving his life where the man himself had left it. In her logic she would have been willing the justice she longed for should have included the innocent as well as the guilty, but he gave her pause by making her reflect that in this instance earthly justice would include the innocent alone.

"Then you mean," she persisted, "that it must all go over to the day of judgment?"

"You know," he returned, "that I never like to say those positive things. But if we suppose that there is a day of judgment in the old sense, what else could it be for except for those sins on which justice has apparently been adjourned from the earthly tribunals?"

"There is something in that," she was forced to own.

"Besides, how do we know that upon this particular sinner justice has not already been done?"

"Why, what ever happened to *him*?"

"The fortitude of a man is no more the measure of his suffering than his weakness is. The strong suffer as much as the weak; only, they do not show it."

"Then you mean that Royal Langbrith suffered all that he made

his wife, and that other wretched woman, and Hope's father, and Dr. Anther, and poor James Langbrith suffer?"

"I don't say that. But could there be fearfuller suffering than his consciousness in his sudden death that he could not undo here the evil he had done? Why should we suppose him to have been without that anguish, if men in the presence of mortal peril are tormented with the instantaneous vision of their whole lives?"

Mrs. Enderby was silent, and measurably appeased. But then the rector went a step farther, and in this it must be owned she could never follow him, great as her faith in him was.

"How do we know but that in that mystical legislation, as to whose application to our conduct we have to make our guesses and inferences, there may not be a law of limitation by which the debts overdue through time are the same as forgiven? No one was the poorer through their non-payment in Royal Langbrith's case; in every high sort each was the richer. It may be the complicity of all mortal beings is such that the pain he inflicted was endured to his behoof, and that it has helped him atone for his sins as an acceptable offering in the sort of vicarious atonement which has always been in the world."

"But the blight—the misery he has left behind him," she protested.

"Why," the rector said, "he seems to have left that around him rather than behind him. He made some of his own generation miserable—Hawberk and his wife, and his own wife, and that other woman, and Anther for them and with them. But Hope and James Langbrith are not unhappy. They are radiantly happy, and more wisely happy for tasting the sorrow which has not passed down to their generation."

"Then you don't believe that the children's teeth are set on edge by the sour grapes their fathers have eaten? What does the scripture say?"

"There are many scriptures, my dear. The scripture also says that the son who has not done the iniquities of the father shall not pay their penalty."

(The End.)

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXIV.

SEPTEMBER, 1904.

WHY THEODORE ROOSEVELT SHOULD BE ELECTED PRESIDENT.

BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

PRESIDENTIAL elections, as a rule, have hitherto belonged to one of two classes. They have either turned upon some one great and dominant issue involving the overthrow of an old policy and the establishment of a new one, or they have been entirely personal. The elections of 1800, of 1860, and of 1896 are examples of the first class. Those of 1824, 1828, and 1884 are examples of the second. In 1800, the question was whether the strong repressive and centralizing policies of the Federalist party should be continued; in 1860, whether the extension of slavery should be arrested; in 1896, whether the country should be placed on a silver standard and alienated from the gold standard of the great commercial nations of the world. In 1824, the "era of good feeling," perhaps more fertile in malignant personalities than any other period in our history, produced a campaign which turned upon the personal characters of the various candidates. The election of 1828, when Jackson defeated Adams, was possibly even more venomous, and that of 1884 was of a similar character. Where a single dominant issue, which arouses deep feeling, pre-

Copyright, 1904, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY All Rights Reserved

vails, candidates occupy a secondary position in the public mind in reaching a decision. In a personal campaign, public policies have been lost sight of, and the contests have sunk to that state of degradation which always arises when votes are sought by virulent and distorted charges, many of them the inventions of malice, against the personal characters and past lives of the contending candidates. Fortunately for the sanity and decency of our politics, these purely personal campaigns have been comparatively few, and our Presidential elections have generally been decided upon some great public issue and the choice between well-defined but opposing policies.

In 1892, the election turned upon the tariff question. The issue was sharply defined; the Republicans, as always, stood for protection, while the Democrats declared for free trade and denounced the protective tariff as unconstitutional. There were, of course, then, as in every campaign, subsidiary issues and subjects of discussion more or less numerous and important; but, stated broadly, the campaign was decided upon the issue of protection or free trade. Upon that issue the Democratic party won. They came into power on the 4th of March, 1893, in complete control of every branch of the government; but, when they brought their principles to the test, they were unable to embody in law the policy they had declared, and upon which they had carried the country. The tariff which they passed was a protective tariff; for the mere fact that they lowered some duties did not alter the economic principle of the measure. The Congressional elections of 1894 turned again on the question of the tariff, and the failure of the Democrats in legislation and in finance had been so complete that they suffered a defeat more crushing than had ever been known when the passions of the country were not excited by war. If this same issue had remained the dominant one in 1896, the election would have been a repetition of those of two years before; but the business depression, with the consequent suffering entailed on all classes of the community, joined to the very natural eagerness of the Democrats to escape from a question upon which they had been already so disastrously routed, led to their making the question of free silver the leading issue of the campaign. The contest of 1896, therefore, was decided upon the money question and only secondarily upon that of the tariff. The Republican party, which stood for a gold standard and for protection, won, and

since then has held complete control of all branches of the government.

Thus returned to power, the Republicans substituted a consistent protective tariff for the incoherent measure of 1894, and established the gold standard as firmly as it was possible to establish it by legislation. This action, with the coming of questions involving the Spanish War, territorial expansion, and the enhanced importance of our foreign relations, pushed into the background the issues of the tariff and the currency, upon which the politics of the country had turned from 1888 to 1896. The result of the past eight years has been, therefore, to produce conditions which give to the pending national campaign a somewhat unusual character. There is no one great and dominant issue, involving the destruction of an old policy or of a settled system of administration, or the establishment of a new policy or system, which absorbs the public mind and upon which it is obvious that the election must turn. On the other hand, there is no opportunity for that meanest of all campaigns, which turns upon charges, and personal attacks upon the characters and careers, both private and public, of the candidates. Yet the issue to be decided is, none the less, a momentous one. It involves, in the broadest way, public policies and national administration, for the policies pursued in the recent past are those of the present moment and of the immediate future. The question for the people to decide this year is, whether these policies shall be carried on as they have been and are now being carried on, whether the government shall be administered as it has been and is now being administered, or whether the policies and administration alike shall be committed to new hands, without any very clear knowledge of what those new hands would do should power be entrusted to them. This question can only be decided intelligently by a consideration of what the party in power has been doing, and what the party out of power seems likely to do under conditions and in the presence of problems which have been existent and vital in the recent past, and are so at this moment. This is very far from being the old demand that the Republican party should be retained in power because it fought the Civil War and abolished slavery, or that the Democratic party should be kept out of power because it supported slavery and opposed the war. The argument here is that the party in control of the government should be

continued in its control because it is at this moment dealing with the same questions which it has been dealing with for the last eight years, and that if it remains in power it will go on dealing with these identical questions in precisely the same manner. It is not necessary to ask what the Republican party proposes to do as to any subject of public interest now present in the minds of the country, but what they have been doing and what they are doing as a matter of fact. In other words, it is upon the action of the Republican party and its administration during the last few years, and upon its policies and its character as contrasted with the attitude, propositions, and character of the Democratic party, that this election must be decided.

Let us now apply this rule to the various questions of public interest before the country in turn and consider the result. Let us begin with the tariff, which is always with us. The Republican party is for protection, as it always has been. A somewhat careful study of the Democratic official utterance upon this question leads one to the conclusion that the Democratic party is not for free trade, but is for some kind of protection which shall be a little different from the Republican kind, but which shall result in a tariff that will suit every district and every State, guard our industries and our labor, be a burden to no one, and afford no help to wicked persons combined in trusts. This kind of a protective tariff which the Democrats propose, is one which everybody desires; but the only law which would meet these requirements is one which has never been drafted, and which exists only in the glittering generalities of the platform-makers. The tariff, however, is eminently a practical question which cannot be settled by unmade laws or unformulated schedules, varying for every district and suited for all localities, and the only real way to decide it is to see what the two parties have done in this direction.

The last Democratic revision of the tariff, whether from a free trade or a protective standpoint, was a gloomy failure. Mr. Cleveland took so dark a view of the performance that he called it "perfidy and dishonor," and would not sign the bill. The last Republican revision of the tariff, on the other hand, has been a great success. Under it the country has had varying degrees of prosperity, but always prosperity, and generally of the highest kind. It has produced abundant revenue, and has been accompanied by the greatest expansion of foreign exports ever known.

If business conditions in the course of the next year or two demand a revision of the tariff, is it not likely to be made better by the party which has been eminently successful in revision than by the party which absolutely failed when that task was committed to it?

Take the currency. The highest authority in the Democratic party, the National Convention, has just assured us that the gold standard is not an issue, and that the Democratic candidates can hold any opinion upon this subject which they see fit. This is liberal and tolerant, but is it reassuring? The gold standard depends upon laws upon the statute-books. These laws were placed there by the Republican party. So long as the Republican party is in power, they will neither be attacked nor repealed, because the Republican President and the Republican party are absolutely at one in their belief in these laws. The Republicans cannot hold any views they desire about the gold standard and remain, properly speaking, Republicans. The Democratic candidate for President voted for Bryan and free silver in 1896 and 1900—and the Democratic candidate for Vice-President voted against the resumption of specie payments act in 1875. They are both of opinion now that the gold standard is fixed irrevocably, but they have themselves shown an interesting flexibility on this important question. Democratic Congressmen and Senators, for their part, are at perfect liberty to go to Washington and make any attacks they please upon our currency laws and upon the gold standard. Even if they should fail in their assaults, agitation about the standard of money and attacks upon it are only less prejudicial to business confidence than the absolute repeal of existing laws would be. It is, in other words, of the utmost importance not only that the President should regard the gold standard as fixed and irrevocable, but that he should believe in the gold standard, a point upon which the Democratic candidate has not instructed us, and that his party should hold that the gold standard is not only fixed and irrevocable, but the only sound standard to be maintained by a great commercial country.

Let us now come to foreign relations, which have assumed a gravity and importance during the last eight years quite unknown to the thirty years which preceded 1896, and which are certain to increase in importance and never again to diminish. Have not our foreign relations been well managed during that period

by the Republican party? I do not think any reasonable man will answer otherwise than in the affirmative. Foreign opinion certainly recognizes in the fullest manner the great success of President McKinley, President Roosevelt, and Mr. Hay in this direction. Could anything have been better than our course in China at the time of the Boxer troubles, or more masterly than the settlement of the difficult Venezuela complications, or more successful than the settlement of the Alaskan Boundary dispute? Are we not at peace with all the world, and were we ever more respected abroad? The last time the Democratic party had control of our foreign relations, they signalized that control by a blundering attempt to reverse the unbroken policy of America in regard to Hawaii, which has since become a territory of the United States, and by taking a feeble attitude toward Spain which showed a complete misconception of existing conditions and made it impossible to avoid war. If the Republican administrations have managed our foreign relations with complete success, and if the last efforts of the Democratic party in that direction were equally conspicuous blunders, why take this all-important power of government from the hands of the successful and give it to the critics who have failed?

The Republicans were responsible for the conduct of the War with Spain. The victory was complete and came in a hundred days, which offers a fair presumption that if the perils of war should again be forced upon us, which no one anticipates, the Republican party will again prove itself capable of meeting such emergencies.

We have dealt successfully with Cuba for the great benefit both of her people and of ours. Is there any reason to suppose we shall not continue to deal well with Cuba, with whom our relations must always be close? Are we not likely to do better than the men who voted against the Platt Amendment and the treaty of reciprocity?

Our administration of the Philippines has been a great and acknowledged success. Law and order reign in the islands to a degree never known before. We have conferred upon the people an amount of civil liberty utterly unknown to them hitherto. We have given them a larger share in their own government than they have ever had, and are steadily increasing their opportunities for self-government. Is it likely that a party which has opposed

every measure for the benefit of the Philippine Islands will administer their affairs better than the party which, in three years, has done so much for them? The Democrats demand that we shall promise them independence, not now, not in five years, not in ten years, nor at any definite time, but simply make an empty promise. The Democrats in this proposition are thinking of votes in the United States which may be gained by such a promise as they propose to offer. The Republicans, thinking of the Filipinos and of their interests, and not of the votes to be gained or lost in the United States, know that nothing could be more harmful to the Philippine people and their interests than to make to them vague promises, or, indeed, any promises which we are not prepared to carry out at once and to the letter.

For three-quarters of a century the United States has been longing, hoping and planning for a canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Within the past eight years, a Republican administration has removed the obstacle to a purely American canal which existed in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Pressing steadily forward, President Roosevelt with swift decision and unhesitating action has acquired for the United States complete control of the best route. Panama has been paid her ten millions, the French rights and all the work done by the French have been bought for forty millions more, and this immense monetary transaction has been carried through without a jar to business or any strain upon the Treasury. A commission has been appointed and the work upon the canal begun. Is it wise to take this vast undertaking from the hands of those who have made it possible and who have started the work, and entrust it to those who have done nothing but clamor for a canal, while they diligently threw every possible obstacle in the way of our having one?

The country has been much excited and public opinion much aroused of late years as to great combinations of capital. The Republican party has enforced the law against these combinations, and has passed new laws to prevent unjust and illegal freight discriminations and to secure due publicity in regard to corporations. The Democratic party, having failed to enforce the law when it had the opportunity, now promises to enforce it if entrusted with power, and alleges that the Republican party, when it enforced the law, did not really mean to do what was actually and effectively done. Is this a sufficient argument for taking the question

from the hands of the party which has really acted upon it, and entrusting it to a party which has contributed to the solution of this difficult problem, requiring the firmest, most careful and most conservative treatment, nothing but lungs and language?

Such in brief review are the pending questions of the campaign; those questions which are of interest to-day, and which are certain to be before Congress and the administration in the immediate future. It is for the people to say whether they wish these questions to be dealt with as the Republican party has been and is dealing with them, or whether they will entrust them to another party which has thus far failed, even when they have had an opportunity, to solve these problems, or which in opposition has shown no greater capacity than to resist Republican action merely because it was Republican.

It only remains now to look at the character of the two parties and their candidates. To attempt to separate a Presidential candidate from his party is always both idle and mischievous. We do not elect a single man to govern the United States. We entrust the government to a party, represented both in the Executive and in Congress. Is the Democratic party as well constituted as the Republican party to carry out governmental policies and deal with existing questions? The ruling element in the Democratic party, both in the Senate and in the House, is furnished by the South, and Southern Senators and Representatives are elected exclusively on a single issue, that of race, which is not an existent question in the Congress of the United States. The result is that the ruling element of the Democratic party in Washington is chosen to office on a wholly irrelevant issue. They agree as to what the relations between the blacks and the whites in the South should be and they agree upon nothing else. When they come to dealing with the tariff they vary in opinion, from the high protectionists of Louisiana to rabid free-traders like Mr. Bourke Cockran of New York. For this reason, they cannot pass a tariff bill because they have no general agreement among themselves upon a tariff policy. In regard to the currency, they vary from the free silver of Nebraska and Nevada to the extreme gold standard of New York, and there is no cohesion among them sufficient to prevent any sort of attack upon the gold standard emanating from their ranks. They clamor for reciprocity, which is essentially a protective policy; yet, when they came to the treaty with Cuba, every vote

but one against Cuban reciprocity was furnished by a Democrat. They were vociferous in their zeal for a canal, and every vote against the treaty, which, for the first time and finally, gave us a canal route, was furnished by a Democrat. Is this incoherent body as good an instrument for government which must be carried on by a political party as the Republican party, which is thoroughly united in general principles and able to formulate its policies in law?

Pass from the parties to the candidates. There is no need, even if I had space, to rehearse the career of President Roosevelt. His views on all the great questions of public policy and administration are familiar to every man and woman in the United States. He has carried on the policies of his predecessor; he has been loyal to Republican principles. He has fearlessly enforced the laws in regard to trusts. His prompt and courageous action has given us the Panama Canal. He has raised the prestige of the Monroe Doctrine to a higher point than ever before, and brought the great nations of the earth to the Hague Tribunal, a signal service to the cause of peace. Under his administration and that of Mr. Root, the Army has been raised to a higher efficiency than ever before. The Navy was never so strong, and wrong-doing in the Departments of the government has been investigated, brought to light, and punished with an entire disregard of personal or political ties. His character is above reproach, his courage is as unquestioned as his patriotism; he is trained to public life and public questions. There is no part of this country which he does not know, and with which he does not sympathize, and the only charge made against him is that he is unsafe because he has shown himself dangerous to law-breakers great and small. He is aware that the highest conservatism lies in the maintenance of the laws, and the most dangerous anarchy in the failure to enforce them. There is no mystery about him, and he has no secrets from the American people. His associate on the ticket is a distinguished Senator and eminent lawyer, trained at the bar and in public life. He is a consistent, lifelong Republican of settled principles and firm convictions. He is fitted in every way in which a man can be fitted for the safe, wise, prudent conduct of government.

Over against President Roosevelt the Democrats have nominated Judge Parker of New York. He, too, is a gentleman of unblemished character. He has been for many years a sound and

respectable, if not a brilliant, judge. His opinions upon public questions are totally unknown, with a single exception. The country is aware now that he believes the gold standard to be fixed and irrevocable. After the Democratic platform had been agreed upon and all references to the gold standard omitted by a formal vote, and after Judge Parker had been nominated by the votes of silver men who had been assured by Mr. Hill that he did not know his candidate's views upon the money question, Judge Parker broke his silver silence with golden speech. Although Judge Parker had voted twice for Mr. Bryan on a platform of free silver at the ratio of sixteen to one, no one supposed that he really meant what his vote said. Every one believed, I think, that he was in favor of the gold standard; but the importance of his telegram consisted in the fact, not that it was an expression of his opinion, but that it converted him to that extent from a name into a person. No safer telegram was ever sent. The courage, which made two or three somewhat neurotic newspapers hysterical, is not equally obvious to sensible men or to those familiar with politics. But the adroitness and effectiveness of the telegram, sent at the precise moment when it could not endanger his nomination, and when it saved the party from being utterly hopeless in the campaign, are beyond question. His associate on the ticket is a most excellent gentleman, of large property and eighty-one years old. I believe that sentence states Mr. Davis's qualifications for the Vice-Presidency completely. The most interesting point about his candidacy is the speculation which it opens, if the Democrats should win, of Judge Parker's Secretary of State, presumably Mr. Hill, attaining to the Presidency.

The parties and their candidates are before the country. The Republican party deserves success because its efficiency as an instrument of government has been proved. It is a party capable of government and of administration. The Democratic party has manifested only incapacity in this direction. The Republican party should be retained in power because its policies have been tried and proved, and because, by its character, its solidarity and its action at the present moment and in the immediate past, it gives a better pledge for a safe, strong and prosperous government than any platform utterances or even than a single telegram can possibly furnish.

H. C. LODGE.

DO OUR PEOPLE WANT AN ARBITRARY GOVERNMENT?

BY WILLIAM F. SHEEHAN.

WE have before us three documents, which may be accepted, we presume, as authoritative expositions of the grounds on which the American people are invited to give the Republican party a further lease of power. These documents are the speech made by ex-Secretary Root, as temporary chairman of the Chicago Convention; the platform adopted by that body, and the speech in which Mr. Roosevelt accepted the nomination.

It will be observed that the Republican programme, as it may be deduced from those utterances, is singularly barren of promises. We scan it in vain for any definite commitments to economy in the national expenditures, to an immediate and reasonable revision of the tariff, to a more drastic prosecution of the unlawful Trusts, to an early recognition of Filipino independence, to a sedulous observance of constitutional limitations in the conduct of the Federal Government, to a vigilant avoidance of involvement in foreign complications and to a renouncement of the notion that the United States are charged with an evangelizing mission to remote and alien peoples. So far as pledges of affirmative action or self-denying covenants are concerned, the Republican party, or the Chief Magistrate who personifies it, will be at liberty to do, or to refrain from doing, almost anything it or he may choose, if a new mandate be secured from the voters on the strength of the vague, reserved, elusive, ambiguous declarations made in the three official or semi-official documents to which we have referred. Mr. Root, the Chicago platform and Mr. Roosevelt himself, concur practically in the assertion that professions and promises on the part of the Republican party would be superfluous, because that party "stands upon its record," and, in view of its past achievements, is

justified in requesting a *carte blanche* for the future. They also concur in adding that while the Republican record constitutes a conclusive voucher of continued fitness for power, the Democratic record presents a tissue of disqualifications, the inference suggested being that to substitute the one party for the other in control of the Federal Government would be an act of lunacy.

It, therefore, behooves thoughtful citizens, who stand outside of partisan lines and hold the balance of power, to inquire whether it be true that performances must always count for more than promises; whether a political party can base upon its record an indefeasible title to continuance in office; whether the Republican record is, as a matter of fact, so free from cloud or blemish as it is depicted; whether, in truth, the Republican party is not, at present, so thoroughly incarnate in Mr. Roosevelt's personality that, mainly if not exclusively, its record must now be sought in the words and the deeds of its nominee; and whether, finally, the Democratic programme as expounded by the wisdom and guaranteed by the character of Chief-Judge Parker, and as accredited by the applause of the conservative leaders who pointed Democrats the way to victory in 1884 and 1892, and whose cooperation is again accepted with cheerfulness and confidence in the campaign now begun, does not justify sober-minded, peaceful, prudent and patriotic voters in regarding the reunited Democracy as a refuge from misgiving and alarm, from the danger of Executive usurpation and extravagance, from the sting of arbitrariness and the yoke of militarism, from disdain of precedent and contempt of law, and from warlike adventures for gain and glory.

I.

There is, of course, nothing new in the claim of a political party to base on past achievements a title to the prolonged retention of public confidence. When in Great Britain the younger Pitt became Prime Minister in December, 1783, the Whigs had enjoyed an unbroken lease of power for seventy years, and in the eyes of their leaders the attempt to supersede them was shocking and almost impious. Nevertheless, a few months later, they sustained an overwhelming defeat at the hands of the constituencies, and the Tory party regained ascendancy, which, except for a brief interval, they continued to hold for forty-six years. If parties ought to be judged by their past performances rather than by their

promises, the Whigs ought to have triumphed in England in 1784, and the Tories in 1830-32; for the former could say with truth that their country owed to them their liberties, and the latter could point with justifiable pride to the dauntless courage and splendid success with which they had carried their native land through the Titanic wars against the French Republic and French Empire. If it be a fact that the record of a party suffices to shield it from defeat, John Adams must have beaten Thomas Jefferson in 1800; for none could deny that the Federalists, during the twelve preceding years, had proved the Constitution to be workable, had solved the problems of the Continental and State debts, had created a stable and efficient government and had brought the Republic safe through a whirlpool of foreign complications. If ever in history a political organization could find in bygone services a voucher of continuing trustworthiness, it was the Republican party in 1876, when Appomattox was but eleven years away; yet we need not recall that its draft on the public confidence was dishonored, so far, at least, as the popular vote for Hayes and Wheeler was concerned.

It is, then, historically true, as it is philosophically just, that political parties cannot be permitted to live indefinitely on their records. New conditions require new measures; new times, new men. In the economical, political and international development of a people, there are certain to arise conjunctures when it becomes a matter of imperative, urgent and vital importance to know, not what a given party has done, but what it means to do; to consider, not what a particular citizen, who is a candidate for public office, may have accomplished under other circumstances, but how he would be likely to meet existing exigencies, or deal with a threatened predicament. John Adams failed to secure a majority of the Presidential electors in 1800, because there was a prevailing impression that the Federalists had gone too far in the way of promoting a centralized and arbitrary government, and that a wholesome corrective was needed in the shape of a Democratic reaction. If a majority of the voters testified their wishes to make Samuel J. Tilden President in 1876, it was because they believed him qualified and determined to purge the Federal Administration of corruption, and because they had no faith in the professed willingness of Republicans to perform the task of self-purgation. This year the Republicans are taking, with reference

to the public demands, necessities and misgivings, the same unsatisfying ground which they occupied in 1876; they try to fasten attention on the victorious conduct of the war with Spain, and to blot from remembrance the hundreds of millions which the retention of the Philippines has cost us; they recall with complacency their establishment of the gold standard, which nobody dreams of disturbing; pluming themselves on a prosperity which, once in a decade, recurs with clocklike regularity, and which is already vanishing, they turn an indifferent ear to the demand for tariff revision; they eschew, as we have said, definite promises and steer clear of explicit pledges which it might be awkward to fulfil; they treat, in fine, the national gratitude as an inexhaustible fund, and exact unlimited discretion by way of interest on the debt under which they assume to have placed the country.

We submit that the claim of the Republican party to stand upon its record came to an end in 1900; that, by eight years of power, it has been amply paid for whatever good work it accomplished under the McKinley Administration; and that, for so much of its record as has been made up since the accession of the present President, it is called upon to defend itself, and to show cause why a writ of ejectment should not issue. As a matter of fact, however, not even an attempt is made, in the Chicago platform or in the President's speech of acceptance, to convince the people that there is ground for expecting anything more to be done by Republicans in the line of tariff revision during the next four years than has been effected in the last three; or for counting upon more prudence, self-restraint, conservatism and respect for law on the part of Mr. Roosevelt in a second term than he has exhibited in his first.

II.

In examining the question whether their record during the last three years is one on which Republicans can reasonably appeal to the country, we must keep steadily in view the fact that it is impossible to differentiate Mr. Roosevelt from his party. It was quite practicable to distinguish General McClellan in 1864 from the dominating element in the Democratic Convention of that year, for he repudiated the principal plank in that convention's platform. Nor can it be denied that distinctions may be drawn between the views of Chief-Judge Parker on some momentous questions and those which, for a time, preponderated in this year's

Democratic Convention, or between the platform framed at St. Louis and his lucid, coherent, sober speech of acceptance. Between Mr. Roosevelt, however, and the Republican National Convention, or between his speech of acceptance and the platform put forward at Chicago, not the minutest line of cleavage is traceable or conceivable, because Mr. Roosevelt held that convention in the hollow of his hand; designated the presiding officers; prescribed the nominations; dictated in advance the platform, of which his speech of acceptance was, logically and inevitably, only a belated echo. In a word, Mr. Roosevelt is the Republican party, if identity of substance be deducible from absolute acquiescence and the total absence of dissent, protest or insubordination. It follows that, when Mr. Root spoke, and when we speak, of the Republican record during the last three years, he meant and we mean, necessarily and exclusively, Mr. Roosevelt's record. It is the President's record, and nothing else, that is the primary, the fundamental, the absorbing issue in this canvass, upon which judgment is to be pronounced at the ballot-box next November. Do the people approve of this record, and of the personality which it unmistakably reveals? If they give Mr. Roosevelt a second term, they will do it with their eyes open, and they cannot afterwards fairly complain of any act on his part which shall be plainly deducible from traits, proclivities and tendencies already disclosed.

Let us look at Mr. Roosevelt's record, of which both he and his party seem to be proud, and with which, undoubtedly, both must stand and fall. We are far from asserting that something may not be said, in the forum of ethics, or from the view-point of temporary expediency, for some of Mr. Roosevelt's acts, to which, nevertheless, exception may be justly taken by scrupulous and far-sighted observers of constitutional and statute law. Let us concede that the President's interposition in the anthracite-coal strike may have been the outcome, not of a craving for popular support, but of a generous impulse, an altruistic desire to relieve a considerable section of the community on the Atlantic seaboard from the hardships caused by a dearth of their customary fuel. From the moment, however, that Mr. Roosevelt swore to obey the Constitution and the laws of the United States, he was no longer at liberty to gratify a sympathetic yearning, unless he could find a warrant for such gratification in the text of the Federal organic law, or in some construction thereof by a Federal tribunal. It is

certain that none of the cases for Federal intervention specified in the Constitution existed in the anthracite region; yet it does not appear that Mr. Roosevelt consulted with his Attorney-General as to the legality of his proposal to mediate between the striking miners and their employers. It may be affirmed with confidence that no counsel learned in the law could have pointed the President to any constitutional authority for such mediation. The President must, therefore, have acted on his own initiative, and it follows that, however exemplary his intention may have been, and however salutary the effect of his act, he established a precedent which, in other hands, and under other circumstances, may be turned to dangerous account.

Much the same thing may be, and ought to be, said about the course which Mr. Roosevelt pursued with an eye to the acquisition of the Panama Canal franchise. Unquestionably, an interoceanic waterway is needed by the United States for strategic as well as commercial purposes; and, unquestionably, the Bogota Executive had agreed to sell the franchise for a specified sum. It is equally indisputable, however, that the Colombian Congress technically had as much right to reject the compact as our own Senate might have asserted, and that, the canal agreement made in Washington having been brushed aside at Bogota, our relations with Colombia should have reverted to the *status quo ante,* and been governed by the Treaty of 1846. It is impossible to reconcile the obligations contracted by us in the last-named Treaty with Mr. Roosevelt's stiff-necked refusal to permit the Colombian authorities to recover by force control of the Isthmus of Panama. To comprehend what Colombians must think of the refusal, we need only ask ourselves what we should have thought in April, 1861, if Great Britain, determined to assure a continued outflow of raw cotton from her principal purveyor, had forbidden us to relieve Fort Sumter. Here, again, we concede that Mr. Roosevelt may have acted for what he believed to be the best interests of his country; but is there not a lamentable want of foresight in the assumption that the United States can afford to stand before the world as a violator of treaties, as the despoiler of a sister commonwealth too feeble and friendless to resist?

III.

Let us pass to some of Mr. Roosevelt's acts and utterances, less easily defended by the plausible plea of good intentions, or on the

score of ostensible expediency. We observe, first, that, in his speech of acceptance, as in the Republican platform, every word of which was dictated or approved by him before it was laid before the Chicago Convention, the President, although at one time a strenuous opponent of high protection, has nothing but eulogy for the Dingley tariff, an embodiment of protection carried to the extreme of prohibition. He has repudiated the position taken by President McKinley at Buffalo, where the urgent need of reciprocity and revision was acknowledged, and he has concurred without hesitation or qualification in the preposterous claim set up by the "Stand-patters" that, if any change in the tariff should conceivably be desirable at some distant day, the formulation of the change should be entrusted only to the men who have profited by its abuses, and who for the last three years have refused to permit any change whatever, except in the matter of a trivial concession to Cuba. By the disavowal of his earlier opinions, and by the violation of the assurances given on his accession to the Presidency, that he would faithfully carry out the policies and the purposes of his predecessor, Mr. Roosevelt has disclosed a willingness to sacrifice cherished convictions and solemn promises to personal ambition and self-interest. This, in the teeth of his professed determination to do fair and equal justice to all men.

The Cabinet which Mr. Roosevelt inherited from his predecessor has been subjected to drastic reconstruction, for no reason, apparent to the ordinary mind, except a determination to place at the head of the Republican National Committee the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, who, with the inquisitorial facilities at his disposal, must have acquired exhaustive information concerning the inner workings of corporations and combinations which are objects of popular denunciation, but from which campaign contributions may be insidiously extracted. How is it possible to apply such adjectives as frank, open, manly, straightforward, to a proceeding so suspicious? How can we marvel that a fair-minded onlooker like Mr. Joseph Pulitzer should have been impelled to ask in his open letter to the President: "What, save a consuming ambition to be elected Chief Magistrate in your own right, could have led you to convert your former confidential secretary and favorite trust-investigator into a professional 'trust-fat-fryer'"?

It was, of course, in the interest of his *protégé,* former Assistant-

Surgeon Leonard Wood, that Mr. Roosevelt created another mischievous precedent, when he called into existence a "constructive recess" between the extra session and the first regular session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, which, as a matter of notorious fact, were merged in one another. It may be said that the performance had no serious consequences; but they who take this indulgent view fail to perceive that the President now betrayed a disposition to disregard a specific mandate of the Constitution, in pursuance of which the commission of Major-General granted to Leonard Wood should have expired at the end of the extra session. That is to say, having presumed, in the anthracite-coal strike, to exercise powers for which no warrant could be found in the Constitution, Mr. Roosevelt was emboldened by impunity to go further, and, in the assertion of a "constructive recess," to defy an explicit prohibition. Neither will the voters fail to mark that this indication of disdain for the limitations of the Constitution was but the culminating demonstration of an inflexible resolve to promote Wood over scores of older and abler men, honored veterans of the Civil War; a promotion which has shocked and demoralized the Regular Army.

We have not yet come to the end of the evidences of contempt for law, which Mr. Roosevelt has not scrupled to afford even now, when, as yet, he is only President by a deplorable accident, and when, as being a candidate for election to the office, he would be restrained by ordinary caution from giving full rein to his natural inclinations. We need not say that Congress alone is clothed by the Constitution with the power to define the qualifications for a pension. Those qualifications have been set forth explicitly in Federal statutes. Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt, by an "Executive order," has announced that the attainment of a particular age shall constitute *prima facie* proof of the physical and mental disability which, by law, entitles certain specified classes of persons to the receipt of pensions.

IV.

If, even in matters of *domestic* administration, and while he is, so to speak, only a President on probation, Mr. Roosevelt has not been able to conceal his impatience of constitutional restraints, to what lengths may he not be carried by a self-willed and domineering temper, in his relations with *foreign* Powers, when he is no longer bridled by the fear of reprobation at the ballot-box, but is

stimulated by the knowledge that the voters, fully alive to his choleric and pugnacious disposition, have deliberately given him a free rein? Can the danger of international embroilment be underrated by thoughtful men, who appreciate how vast and elastic are the war powers of a President, and how easily a Chief Magistrate, under our Constitution, can contrive a pretext for calling those powers into exercise? The right of formally declaring war is reserved by our organic law to Congress; but, as one of Mr. Roosevelt's predecessors is said to have pointed out, the President may, at any time, force Congress into hostilities. It is well known that, in 1846, President Polk brought on a war with Mexico by ordering our troops into disputed territory. There is no doubt, also, that a President may, by his Executive order, by his negotiations, or by his refusal to negotiate, so entangle us in a foreign complication, that it may be impossible for Congress to withhold a declaration of war.

When, moreover, hostilities have been formally begun, the war power of a President has been justly described by Mr. Bryce as that of a dictator. Under President Lincoln, this power was carried to an extreme that could scarcely be surpassed in despotic principle, for it involved the substitution of military for civil authority and the arbitrary suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*. The tremendous capabilities of an American Chief Magistrate in respect of provoking wars, and of usurping supremacy under the pretext of waging them, have never been as yet thoroughly revealed, because, down to the present time, our Presidents have been, by nature and discipline, conservative and cautious men. No careful student of our Constitution has ever expressed a doubt, however, that, if a Cæsar or a Napoleon should ever become President, he could make of the Executive almost anything he wished.

Do prudent citizens, who wish to see their country shielded from foreign entanglements, deem it safe to entrust the war-provoking and war-waging powers of a President to Mr. Roosevelt, in view of the proofs that he has given of a bellicose, reckless and meddlesome spirit, by the despatch of war-ships to Beirut, Morocco and Smyrna, on insufficient information or with impossible demands; and in view of his startling intimation to Latin-American republics that, unless they not only make reparation for public wrongs, but pay promptly to foreign creditors all debts arising out of contracts, they may look for coercive intervention on the part

of the United States? Do our citizens really mean to authorize their Chief Magistrate to act as judge, jury and sheriff in the case of every European claim put forward against delinquent or bankrupt commonwealths of the New World?

V.

The American people are not forced to accept Mr. Roosevelt for a pilot, nor his dangerous conception of a President's duty for a chart, during the quadrennial voyage which will begin on March 4, 1905. They have before them an alternative; and they will only have themselves to blame if their heedless or perverse neglect to take it shall prove to them hereafter a source of bitter regret and sorrow. In an hour of enlightenment and patriotic fervor, when perhaps they builded better than they knew, the Democratic party put forward at St. Louis, for the august, commanding and largely judicial office of Chief Magistrate, a man who, in temperament, character, experience, training, methods, ideals and aspirations, is the antithesis of Mr. Roosevelt. That man's record is a life spent upon the bench, where he has been taught to subordinate ambition to duty, where loyalty to law has become as the breath of his nostrils, and where he has learned to steer by the pole-star of the common weal. How he would guide the ship of state, if the helm should be confided to his hand, may be seen from his speech of acceptance, in which his principles and intentions are stated in modest, clear, plain, unmistakable language, instinct with simplicity, sobriety and truth. He promises no more than he believes he can perform; he makes no professions which he has no hope of translating into acts. Of this, at least, however, his fellow countrymen may feel assured, to wit, that, if they shall make Alton Brooks Parker their Chief Magistrate, they will enter upon an era of safe, economical, unpretentious, constitutional administration, a reign of law, a régime of peace.

WILLIAM F. SHEEHAN.

MAGAZINE WRITING AND LITERATURE.

BY HENRY MILLS ALDEN, EDITOR OF "HARPER'S MAGAZINE."

In the criticism of contemporary literature, not only our own contemporary literature but that of previous ages, there has always been a tendency on the part of academically trained critics to disparage the present as compared with the past. This tendency discloses the vice as well as the virtue of that conservatism which has the long view backward but the limited view of the present and future, and which, while it holds to the established best, ignores the best that is in the making.

As a corrective, we need for literature such a plea as Professor Lounsbury is in the habit of interposing for language—a protest against the purist and an apology for legitimate freedom and flexibility. Professor Lounsbury's defence of new locutions should find, for a proper adjustment of our critical view, a counterpart in some equally effective justification of new literary styles, in so far as these stand for new attitudes of the human intelligence and sensibility toward life and the world.

Our judgment is not merely a matter of orientation—the turn of our thought backward through well-worn channels to familiar traits and canons which have the sanctions of classical authority. We incur the peril of a vast ignorance if, in our regard for the continuity of human culture, we confine ourselves to a retrospective view, and disregard, or court only for our amusement, the novel phenomena which constantly present themselves in the field of literature and which seem, in our conventional view, "sports of nature" and violently reactionary. So a follower of the Hesiod cult might have regarded the invasion of the Homeric influence, which turned out to be the inspiration of what was best in Hellenic art and literature. So Doctor Johnson must have looked upon the swelling current of romanticism

which swept away the artificial decorations and conventions of two generations of English classicism.

We of the East, accustomed from the beginning to look across the Atlantic for our models and inspirations, have given too little heed to the development of the new spirit in the West, excepting as it has been embodied in the personality of a statesman like Lincoln or of a humorist like Mark Twain. That way lies for us the freshly unveiled Pacific, our dream of Empire, and the magnificent realization of material grandeur and enterprise—a realm of vast adventure which for more than fifty years has been invested with the golden glamour of Argonautic romance. We have felt all this, but we have failed to comprehend the mental attitude of the people who have accomplished these material results—an attitude developed in the light and shadow, and under the stimulus and oppressiveness, of such achievement.

Therefore the sympathetic and luminous exposition which Professor Henry Loomis Nelson has recently given us of the Middle West has arrested general attention, as a novel disclosure of character and conditions. He has brought within his consideration not only the Middle West but what, in a very original discrimination, he calls the Eastern West and the Western West. These papers of Professor Nelson, in themselves excellent examples of a new kind of interpretation which, in the natural course of progressive development in magazine writing, has become possible, taken in connection with Mrs. Elia W. Peattie's brilliant studies of literature and society in the same region, show us to what an extent the strenuous men of the West are absorbed in schemes of mechanical progress and commercial expansion, while social and intellectual culture is established and maintained by the women. It appears, too, that, as the men admire those intellectual functions which they have no time for, so the women take peculiar pride in the splendid material achievements of their husbands and brothers, and seek to rival these in the field so wholly committed to their charge—to do as striking things in society and literature as the men are doing in bridge-building, in sky-scraping architecture, in gigantic business combinations.

This was not the case thirty years ago on the Pacific Coast, though it is so to-day. There and then it was from men that we heard the note of an original departure both in literature and art, and we had the reward of our listening. How distinct was the

local color and flavor of the Pacific literature of that period! Now the conditions are much the same as in the Middle West, save that there is on the part of the predominant women greater tension of sensibility and mental activity.

What is now in evidence in this Western field is an immense and eager audience—eager for some things, and as firm in its protest against other things. What is its attitude? This, surely, is an interesting inquiry. The audience is the determining factor in the making of a literature; its demands are imperative. The West has been postulant from the beginning, and its present intellectual requirements have an importance in the shaping of our literature equal to that of its earlier economical demands in shaping the internal policy of our government.

What is the kind of literature that the West wants, and against what does this great audience forever utter its protest? The inquiry is the more pertinent because our new writers are called upon to choose between old and new methods of appeal. The question can never be whether the writer should abandon established standards of literary taste. Such a question is not pertinent to our inquiry. No cultivated American audience, East, South, or West, advocates, much less demands, a lower literary art. Nor is the new writer's choice one between listening to the voice of England's Poet Laureate, Alfred Austin, on the one hand, calling him back to very old and formal ways—over a century old—and, on the other, to the voice of Gertrude Atherton in her recent protest against what she calls a bourgeois literature.

Alfred Austin does not fairly represent the cause of fidelity to the continuity of culture; else he would not have with so easy agility, involving an implication of contempt, overleaped the entire and mightily vital Victorian era, to find the worthiest examples both of good writing and of an intellectual audience. Nor does Mrs. Atherton in any fair sense voice the demand made by intelligent Western readers, or their protest. She does not attempt to do this; she speaks only for herself and for those who agree with her as to what our literature should and should not be. She rests with a good conscience, since in her last novel, "The Rulers of Kings," she has done her part, furnishing a splendid example of the kind of fiction she favors, and the success of her book sets upon it the stamp of approval of a large and respectable class of readers. We can easily understand that the women of

Chicago, St. Louis and San Francisco see in this novel a realization of their fond expectation in one respect at least—in that it is a production in literature as striking and wonderful as the most magnificent monument of modern masculine enterprise. Yet it can hardly be said to adequately and exactly respond to the expectations of that Western culture which has been developing during the last two generations—expectations so just and reasonable as to be worthy not only of the respect but of the careful consideration of all lovers of good literature.

Those of us who, during the period mentioned, have given close attention to the course of books, with reference to their appreciation in different sections of the country, remember that any literary work of exceptional value, whether as a manifestation of genius or as a novel disclosure of spiritual truth, whatever its reception elsewhere, has always been sure of a hearty response from beyond the Rockies, where was the nucleus of the early growth of culture in the West. The people who migrated from New England carried with them to their new homes their intellectual tastes and habits, building churches and schools and colleges, and establishing newspapers; and while the South cherished local independence almost to the point of exclusiveness, owing to its peculiar institution, the West long cherished a feeling of dependence, beseeching means of easy communication with Eastern centres, that it might not be cut off from the currents of the old-home and the Old-World culture. The demand of this people, adventurous but unwillingly remote, for good literature afforded an eager market for books; and the one periodical that in those early days had a general circulation instinctively adapted itself to meet the far-off need for such educational aliment as schools and libraries could not furnish, and even gave from six to eight pages to a well organized Monthly Record of Current Events, while its fiction—always the best of the time—supplied the wants of the imagination, and its illustrated articles of travel brought the whole world to the mining-camp and the settler's cabin as well as to cultivated homes in comparatively isolated regions.

In the course of time has come the inevitable reaction; new currents of thought and feeling have been set in motion, arising from a new kind of civilization which is not merely a reflection of the old, and whose peculiar traits indeed are more accentuated now that it is in full communication with the world than in its earlier

isolation. Opposition has been generated by a kind of induction. These peculiar traits are the result really of a slow and unconscious development and are intimate and subjective as distinguished from external peculiarities of tone, manner and speech. They indicate modes of thought and feeling—the psychical attitude. If we were to express this attitude in positive terms, we should speak of it as vital, tense, and intuitively direct—just what we would expect of a culture which has come to follow the lead of feminine inspiration. *Dux femina facti;* and this leadership, it must be admitted, is reinforced by the inspiration of all the great masters in the whole line of human culture. Very much of the energy engaged in this development is exhausted in social activities and for practical ends; it certainly does not as yet produce many eminent authors, and the immediate atmosphere—the overpowering material environment—is not conducive to great authorship, though by reaction the psychical sensibility is deepened, the result of which is an audience of distinguished readers whose attitude toward literature must have a profound influence in shaping and directing it.

We find it easier, therefore, to give an idea of the traits of this femininely conducted, though by no means effeminate, Western culture in somewhat negative terms. Open to all currents of the world's past and present thought and, as we have said, reinforced by them, it reacts upon them as it does upon its own immediate environment. As, in the latter case, the psychical rises to oppose the material, so against all the influences of the world's culture is developed an impatience of the traditional and conventional forms through which these influences offer their values. The values are appreciated but the forms are repudiated—especially such old forms as seem the cerements rather than the fresh and natural investiture of present and living thought.

This, in the main, is the protest, and it is a note more worth heeding than that of the Poet Laureate. It is not a protest against art but against artifice. Of course we are considering the demands made by a cultivated audience, which, while it lays little stress upon what Mrs. Meynell calls "the trick of education," does especially insist upon training, upon a thorough intellectual equipment as essential to authorship. In the West, as everywhere else, there is an outlying audience, clamoring for its own kind of satisfaction and getting it abundantly. The audience I have in

view, though cultivated, is distinctly bourgeois and proudly calls itself middle-class; but it is the kind of middle-class which is produced by democracy in conditions which have freed it from the trammels of tradition and the masks of hypocrisy; it is non-conformist, not whiningly or fanatically, but instinctively, by an almost unconsciously developed attitude — an earnest psychical attitude which more intently regards the theme than any form of premeditated art in which the theme is expressed.

The feminization of culture is not exclusively a peculiarity of the West, or even of America; it is a characteristic of our period, of the stage which we have reached in our civilization. Democracy, too, has done its work in the East as well as in the West, though it has not destroyed so much wheat along with the tares. The fact that the leadership of Western culture is so exclusively feminine must in great measure account for its comparative sterility. Where this leadership is to a greater extent shared by both sexes and there is a considerable class of men not so absorbed in strenuous enterprise but that it has time to devote to art and literature, independently of social and practical considerations, there is naturally more fruitfulness in the higher field of creative work.

Some characteristic Western traits of an earlier period have disappeared. In the present situation there is no chance for the development of humor or for the existence of the mood and temperament from which humor spontaneously flows. How much might as well as mirth—all the masterly traits, indeed, of the creative spirit—must in the nature of things vanish from a realm of culture so exclusively dominated by women! Equally true it is that, by just as natural limitations, many of the traits which we most highly prize as indispensable in our modern world—not merely of daintiness and grace but of spiritual strength—would be wanting under exclusive masculine domination. Miss Austen inaugurated a new era when she entered the field as a writer of English fiction.

But there is no sterility like that of a feminized culture, unruffled by the masculine spirit, vexed to its depths only by its own feverish unrest. There is in it no sense of the morning, of the springtime or of any tokens of renascence. Mrs. Peattie confesses to this lack when she says: "If candor and splendor and truth are to come into American literature, they must come by way of immigrants from the nations of unabashed sentiment,

who, singing songs in this land, sing with their faces turned to the sun,—not toward a group of carping matrons sitting in conclave on all honest and free-spoken words."

But is the estate of American literature really so low that even a Western writer should indulge in this far-reaching orientation, looking to the effete Old-World for its rejuvenescence?

I could not so effectively enter seriously upon the consideration of the theme indicated in the caption of this article as after repeating this cry from the wilderness, having first led up to it and given a significance to its location by what I have had to say about what has long been and must continue to be the largest constituency of American books and periodicals, about the importance of its demands in shaping the course of our literature, about the value of its protest, and about its peculiar culture—its advantages and its limitations.

But first I must let Mrs. Peattie's complaint conclude itself, since it furnishes her explanation of what is called "the deterioration of our literature." "The matrons," she says, "have killed the New England literature. They have edited the magazines, ruled the book-publishers, and broken the hearts of the poets. They will have an awful reckoning some day . . . when they shall stand and tremble before the Truth, and find all their proprieties an insufficient barrier!"

Well, it would seem that the day of judgment has already come; for magazine editors, indeed, it has been a year of judgment. For Mrs. Peattie only repeats what Mrs. Atherton has said before and what the casual correspondents of newspapers and even newspaper editors have without end reiterated. If Mrs. Peattie really meant to call magazine editors matrons—that might seem original, and perhaps to some of the group unpleasant, though, for one, I don't mind it; there is a kind of dignity in the title. But the context forbids this idea of a personal insinuation. She really refers to a very respectable class of women for whom I shall interpose no defence—they need none. If they have really done what Mrs. Peattie says they have done, their work seems to have been pretty effective, and I should leave them to their dreadful arraignment. In fact, however, they have done none of the things attributed to them. They have always been a very harmless, inoffensive kind of women, too busy with other things to edit magazines or to act as literary advisers to publishers. At least, in an experience of

more than forty years in association with a publishing-house, I have never known of any meddling on their part with the business, except in rare cases after the fact.

I have always understood that the publishers who issued "Jane Eyre" and "Adam Bede" did so without any previous consultation with matrons or any thought of them, leaving them to talk it over afterwards with the same fearless freedom. I never knew a publisher to reject a novel that was on its literary and dramatic merits worth publishing, except when it was indecent or was likely to have an actually immoral influence—the kind of thing which would have been as unpleasant reading to himself as to any reader, even a matron. "Trilby" was published not only as a book but as a magazine serial. It was not immoral, but it was unmoral—as unmoral as childhood is. Two or three matrons wrote protesting letters, but most of the few complaints made came from men. Thomas Hardy's "Tess of the D'Urbervilles" was published serially in "Harper's Bazar," and his "Jude the Obscure" (under another title) in "Harper's Magazine." If publishers of books and magazines err in this matter, it is likely to be on the side of daring, not from adventurous intention but in unconscious innocence. They are not afraid to confront Truth—even with a capital T.

Indeed, it is this very Truth, with all the candor and splendor that attend it and all its inherent majesty, that the best literature of to-day in books and magazines confronts without tremor. This is as true of our literature as of our science. It is a direct and intimate attitude, and we frankly credit the West with having helped us to it. But it is the trait of our time, as well in the East as in the West, however we may have come by it. It indicates a distinct advance in our culture, which in literature brings us ever more and more face to face with the essential truths of life, just as in science it insists upon the closest scrutiny of physical phenomena. The supreme interest of the greatest fiction of our time is in its psychical interpretations and disclosures. This interest excludes no really vital theme, but only that false and shallow and even meretricious masquerade of human passions and sentiments which vitiated the fiction of a former age, and which no cultivated reader now tolerates. Even Zola is pathologically true, and has his proper place in the respect of readers who seek that kind of truth. In English and American fiction the writers

who have developed the psychical method—among whom Henry James stands both as the type and as first in the exemplification of the type—have kept within the limits of a normal exposition. The good and evil are inseparably mingled in our human life—our chief wonder being, as Mrs. Deland has said, the badness of people who are called good and the goodness of those who are called bad—so that the shadows have their place in the brightest picture, and they are not to be evaded by any shuffling. We willingly follow where the path inevitably leads—to see life as it is.

I do not say that everything which could be published with propriety in a book could fitly be published in a magazine. The purchaser chooses his book; the magazine goes to an audience to which it is committed by a pledge, in part explicit, but for the most part a matter of implicit understanding. But the limitation does not arise from an embarrassing moral constraint. That is scarcely felt; the editor is not consciously aware of it; his resistance is against weak, unworthy stuff. There are doubtless authors who revel in brutalities, who enjoy an infernal habitation not for its purgatorial fires but for its sulphurous airs, and who complain because they may not make their descents before a polite audience; but these things do not come within the scope of the demand of any species of human culture.

Every magazine in the course of its development establishes an expectation as to the field it will occupy and the kind of themes it will treat. Hence arises its principal limitation. Fifty years ago, a popular magazine intended for general circulation must have been educational in a sense that it need not be to-day. For a long time it must have treated themes now wholly relegated to special periodicals. One thing it never could have excluded—that is, the best current literature.

It is fortunate in the interests of a general culture and of literature especially that a great magazine to-day may have as its distinguishing limitation the exclusion of specialties, retaining only within its scope such scientific, historical and descriptive articles as are novel disclosures in their several fields. It may even avoid all timely or occasional topics, so adequately treated by the daily and weekly press, thus devoting nearly its entire space to what is known as the literature of power. The cultivated reader is so greatly the gainer by this that he will not complain, since whatever is omitted is easily accessible elsewhere, while he is not sure

of having the best current literature, or of having so much of it, in any other way.

The contributor sometimes complains of the exclusion of some things in favor of others where the editor cannot say, "these lie outside the scope of our magazine." There is a law of selection by comparison. Out of a score of good things perhaps but one is chosen, the one considered the best in the editor's judgment, and yet the magazine is filled from month to month with these chosen contributions. Had the others been accepted also, they would never see the light except as excluding better things. It may be that among those rejected some one thing is ideally beautiful—a prose-poem, perhaps, which would be a delightful satisfaction to a few readers, to whom either by itself or together with other things having the same rare quality it should come in the shape of a book, to be read at leisure, and not, as in a magazine, mingled with elements out of harmony with it, not pitched to the same far-off note. This may be the case of a poem, an essay, or a story. This is simply saying that for magazine use the near, and still more the intimate, note is preferred. Of two poems having equal poetic merit—one concerning some object in nature, a bird or a flower, and the other a direct appeal of a human theme to human sensibility—the latter would be chosen. Yet a creation of the highest order, like Shelley's "Ode to the Skylark," would be choice-compelling. It is true even of books that the large polite audience—that upon whose patronage our best magazines depend --demands the intimate human appeal, and books which do not have it reach only a select class of readers.

In our first-class magazines Nature sketches find a place, in due proportion, and in greater variety than ever before. The charge against these magazines, that they have given up their space mainly to fiction and fail to meet the wants of readers in other directions, is made perhaps without due examination. New disclosures of physical phenomena; luminous interpretations of history; revisions of old and mistaken views based upon freshly discovered material; the most recent revelations of archæological exploration; the result of current sociological experimentation; studies of tendencies characteristic of the civilization of to-day and of imperfectly understood conditions of civilization in earlier times; studies also which are the result of travel and observation among peoples never before heard from and of the re-

action of a creative imagination upon material which seemed familiar, but which for the first time yields to a new interpretation its inmost secrets—affording a fresh field of wonder; narrations of singular adventure: all this from writers the most authoritative, where first-hand authority is essential, and, as to those themes whose treatment depends for its interest upon genius, by writers acknowledged to be of the first rank, wholly apart from their contributions to magazines. In this summation of features I am not considering a magazine's contents taking a whole year into the view; a single number will contain something of nearly all this varied entertainment. The articles will not be elaborate, as in a Review, but concisely comprehensive, suggestive and illuminative; they are just what cultivated readers want.

There would not be so much fiction given in a magazine were it not true that in novels and short stories the life of this and other times has its most faithful portraiture, so that they stand for many an essay and article.

If I am all along confessing to certain limitations of the magazine, it is not unwillingly. I desire to confess frankly that in literature the book and not the magazine is the supreme thing. In some ways the magazine conveys books to its readers, in serial fiction and in series of short stories and sketches and important articles—books which are among the best of their time. But, outside of fiction, the great books of all time stand by themselves in a world where the magazine is not. The exaltation of this world is in the matter of themes. So far as quality is concerned, the isolation does not exist. Though I have admitted that some things ideally beautiful, but appealing to a few select readers, are excluded from magazines, the exclusion is because of their themes, not because of their excellence. There are magazines and magazines, of course, and a large number of them are addressed to that outlying audience of which I have said that it has no intimate relation to the best culture of our time; and while some of these periodicals like to be, and in many ways are, interesting to very thoughtful readers, they could not depend upon these for their extensive patronage. But the magazine whose constituency is limited to a cultivated audience, one which is constantly increasing with the steady advance of culture, cannot meet the demands of that audience by the adoption of any standard lower than the best. It cannot seek writers whose sole

aim is popularity or those who have achieved only that. It must have the best current literature obtainable and therefore the greatest writers of the time, and it gets these writers. The greatest novel of the year is being published serially in one magazine of this class. Who are the greatest writers of short stories and poems? It is these whose work is appearing in our magazines from month to month. Their first encouragement came from magazines. Liberal remuneration for their contributions has made it possible for many of them to persevere in literary work, and the work itself is better than that of any former period in the history of periodical literature. But, excellent as it is, this demand of the audience and therefore of the magazines is always for something better.

This is a sufficient answer to those who hold magazine editors responsible for "the deterioration of literature." The complaints made are contradictory, one to another. Some critics, who have given very little attention to the real character of magazine literature, assert that contributors in order to succeed must "write down" to it. The main complaint, in which many writers join, is that they are required to "write up" to it. This complaint has reference even more to themes that are excluded than to requirements as to style, though the one point usually implies the other. It is objected that the magazine editor "wants better bread than can be made of wheat," that he sets himself up as a "ruler of literature," trampling upon every spark of genius and repudiating all that is primal and elemental, and that he is especially shocked by the expression of "unabashed sentiment."

Everything in its place and time commands respect. Crudeness precedes development in all evolution. But it would be unjust to treat the complaint as a plea for crudeness. Much as it sometimes seems like it, it is not meant to be that. If we allow the complainant to state his own case, he would say that instead of favoring retrogression—a reversion to a lower order of development—he stands as the advocate of those reactions which especially characterize the most advanced stages of human civilization. The plant or the animal developed into new varieties by artificial selection, if again left to itself, reverts to its original type, and this might properly be called degeneration. But in human development the progress involves a series of reactions, peculiar to a rational consciousness, which is itself due to the breaking of

vital currents, and which gains in stability with the increased complexity of the brokenness. All nature has this divided living, and the division is multiplication; but in man it has a peculiar significance because it is a psychical process, involving reflection which gives him the choosing will, so that in his progress he does not always go straight on in inevitable courses, but turns upon himself at will and, in spiral fashion, goes forward half of the time by going backward. Thus the call for the primal and elemental is forever recurrent, in each downward course of the spiral ascent.

This is all true and strictly philosophical. Man goes back upon himself in a way that Nature does not—except at vast intervals when she also declares, "I care for nothing, all shall go." This proclamation man—the most tropic of all beings—makes often in quick reactions and revolutions. His spirit builds for itself a complex edifice full of life and light in which for a time it rejoices; then it cherishes it for itself, and as the surfaces harden it delights in giving them the polish they are ready to take; it refines all outward means of expression, revelling in forms of exquisite grace and measure, and multiplying the conceits and caprices of its architecture. Then the windows grow dull; there is death at the extremities where life has exhausted itself in accomplishments that now turn to vanities; the spirit, burdened by what seemed its weight of glory, is lulled to sleep by its muffled music. This is the course of every age, and at every fresh awakening of the human spirit the mortal coil of the formal structure is shuffled off, and in the rude light of the new morning, as in "the freshness of the early world," men are with the gods again, who are so poor that their gifts are only of raw material. What wonder that, when refinements become glosses and all our vesture a masquerade, we long for that primal poverty!

But the plea for the elemental in literature does not seem quite justified, since we already have had so much of it, the literary pendulum having so long swung that way. More than a century ago the reaction began against the perruque and pirouette in literary pantomime and all the artificialities of Queen Anne's time; it has been going on ever since, and it has gone so far, that, by an opposite reaction, many look with a kind of envy to the formal graces of that remote period which have for them the fascination of the eighteenth-century minuet.

We in America have had our Walt Whitman, and if there is any variety of "unabashed sentiment" with which the fiction of the last twenty years has not made us acquainted, we are willing to forego further knowledge of it.

In good and bad literature—in that which appeals to the cultivated and that which panders to a lower taste—this reaction has done its best and worst for us. I do not mean to say that it has run its course, and that it has no new glories to disclose. Our attitude toward the mightiest realities of life, the most elemental truths, is more direct and intimate than ever before; and it is so in magazines as well as in books. The magazine editor has cherished rather than resisted it, and he expects of it, if nothing better than it has already yielded, yet a new revelation of its possibilities. It is true that he favors the most artistic—that is, the most developed—expression of intimate truths, for the characteristic trait of a period is sure not only to determine the writer's theme but to shape his style. Elemental truths may be conveyed more effectively in the exquisite art of Meredith, James, Hardy, Howells, Hewlett, and Mrs. Humphry Ward, than in the uncouth forms which, because of their crudeness, may seem to some especially suited to their expression.

Nevertheless, the editors of our best magazines do not reject the contributions of the less developed writer who promises great things to come—great in rare art as well as in rare insight. Those writers now proclaimed the greatest were in their lesser day diligently fostered by these magazines.

The most unjust and, even on the part of those who ought to know better, the most prevalent complaint is that magazine editors suppress individuality, either by its entire exclusion or by its corruption through the imposed obligation to accomodate itself to editorial requirements. On the contrary, it is individuality that the wise editor most eagerly looks for and most sedulously cultivates. Apart from the wholly worthless stuff offered, more contributions are rejected because their writers have made a point of accommodation than for any other reason. It is only as a writer expresses himself, utters his own note, that he has any value. He may see that work in a field which he likes is hospitably entertained by editors and be very properly encouraged to write in the line of his own genius, but if he does over again what has already been done or something nearly resembling it, his contri-

bution is not wanted. Most useless is his offering when he laboriously cultivates a style or selects a theme which seems to him, or which he has been led to believe, especially suited to magazines. The most obviously "magazinish" thing is the most unmagazinable. Any attempt toward accommodation injures the contributor's chance of success.

There are limitations which the contributor does well to regard, but they are negative. Magazines intended for general circulation must of course exclude politics and theology. A magazine of this class must avoid the article too general in its treatment or too elaborate, also the article too special or too technical, assuming an audience devoted to a particular field; that is, it must not be distinctively an art, a historical, or even a literary magazine. These magazines differ, one from another, in their limitations. Some favor and some exclude the timely topic. But all must have variety, and this necessity imposes a limitation as to the length of individual contributions, though each of these, whether an article or a story, must have a scope adequate to the satisfaction of thoughtful readers, even at the sacrifice of variety.

As to quality, however, there is no limitation which excludes the highest excellence. As I have said, the book is the supreme thing; but not only does the magazine avail of this supreme value in its serial fiction, but in all its varied contents it demands, as to quality, the excellence which gives the best book its supremacy, and which so many books lack. A single number of a first-class magazine, though it fully serves the purpose for which it was created, and in its scope and quality gives satisfaction, may seem to the critic, though not a miscellany, still, at the best, a fragmentary collection; but taking the numbers, *seriatim*, as the reader takes them, for a year, for a generation, they furnish a unique illustration of the progress of literature and, if illustrated, of art—a progress which the magazine has stimulated as well as exemplified.

The intimate relation of the periodical publications of a country to its literature has existed for more than two centuries. The earliest periodicals were guides to literature, and were almost technically bibliographical, intended of course for a select audience. The coffee-house periodical of the eighteenth century, of which "The Spectator," "The Tatler" and "The Rambler" were

characteristic types, was addressed to the "town" and consisted of graceful essays on literary and social topics, contributed by the "wits of the town," like Addison, Steele and Johnson; and these contributions are a part of English classical literature. Later, "The Gentleman's Magazine"—the first to seek a general audience—and "Blackwood's," engaged the most brilliant as well as the most learned writers of the day. The monthly magazines which followed these in rapid succession—"Temple Bar," "The Cornhill," "Colburn's," "Bentley's Miscellany," and the rest, maintained a literary reputation equal to that of the best current literature. So it has been in America. Of all that is important in our literature the span is so short as not to transcend the immediate observation of men now living, but from the first, and in the whole course of its development, the magazine has been eminently participant of such glory as it has shown. Poe wrote first for magazines his best stories, his best poems, his best literary criticism; and ever since his time, with rare exceptions, our great writers, both before and after the establishment of their reputations, have been inseparably associated with our periodical literature and have received from it their principal emolument.

The catholicity of magazines and their hospitality to young writers have done more than all other influences to build up our literature.

Always we revert to the audience, which is the determining factor in all literature. Whatever that is most creditable may be said of our best magazines reflects credit upon the culture of that audience, whose demands are not less exacting than its response is quick and generous. The whole country makes up this audience of to-day, and whatever the diverse demands of different sections, these are equally worthy of respect and represent values which will be more evident for what they really are when distinct currents shall have fully reacted upon each other and blended into that harmony which shall characterize the American audience of the future.

HENRY MILLS ALDEN.

SECTIONAL MISUNDERSTANDINGS.

BY ROBERT BINGHAM.

I.

It is obvious to those who have eyes to see that a better understanding between the sections of our common country is in progress, and it may hasten that progress to look some of the causes of this misunderstanding squarely in the face, not in a spirit of crimination or recrimination, but from an historical and philosophic rather than from a sectional point of view.

An armed conflict between the reserved rights of the thirteen independent republics acknowledged by Great Britain in 1783, and the rights, powers and necessities of the National Government which these independent republics formed in 1789, was inevitable from the first. This conflict culminated in 1860. The people of the South, deeming their constitutional and reserved rights of local self-government invaded, appealed to the sword and lost. Having appealed to the sword, they accepted the decision of the sword in good faith, and no part of the Union is more loyal to the flag than the South, or more ready to take up arms in its defence. All are agreed that slavery had lasted as long, probably, as it was beneficial to the black man, and as long as the white man could stand it without losing strength; that the white man was emancipated rather than the black man; and that the New South is already greater, richer and more powerful than the Old South could ever have been.

Whatever the right of secession may have been theoretically, the whole South sees as one man that it was a great mistake to fight for a national unity on the basis of disunity at will afterwards. If the secession theory had prevailed, the Anglo-Saxon man in America must have been divided into as many petty and warring republics as there were local and conflicting interests.

The monarchical form of government, which, as a matter of history, was the thing most feared and most carefully provided against by the founders of the Republic, might and probably would have taken root in North America.

II.

Such at the beginning of the twentieth century is the practically unanimous opinion of the people of the South about secession and slavery, the honest differences of opinion about which in 1860 brought on the Civil War and its sequences. But let us look calmly and dispassionately at the conditions which prevailed at the end of the eighteenth century and during the first half of the nineteenth, in order to get the true historical and philosophic perspective as to the differences of opinion which crystallized so sharply in 1860.

When the Union was formed, there was no difference of opinion about secession or slavery. Every one of the original thirteen States was a slave State, and the Constitution put a premium on property in slaves by allowing a slaveholder five-fifths of a vote for himself and three-fifths of a vote for each of his adult slaves, not recognizing the seven hundred thousand slaves then in the Union, according to the census of 1790, as men at all, whose right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" Anglo-Saxon men were expected to respect at all. Nor were the remnant of the red men, numbering one hundred and fifty thousand, perhaps, regarded as men with any rights to life, liberty or the pursuit of happiness, or even to the soil which had belonged to them and to their ancestors for unnumbered generations. Thus the Declaration of the Independence of three million Anglo-Saxon men carried beneath it the unquestioned right to enslave seven hundred thousand black men, and to dispossess and slay the remnant of the red man. But by degrees the people of the North found slavery unsuitable to their climate and conditions; and they sold their slaves to those whose climate and conditions were more favorable. Thus slavery gravitated out of the North into the South, and became sectional.

Before 1830, or thereabout, there seems to have been but little awakening of conscience on the question of slavery among the people of New England. But before 1800 there had been a widespread repugnance in the South to the slave-trade; and, while New

England was actively engaged in it, the Legislature of Virginia was actively protesting against it.

In 1769, the Legislature of Virginia prohibited the further importation of slaves;* and, in the Federal Convention of 1787, New England voted with South Carolina and Georgia for the prolongation of the slave-trade for twenty years, that is, to 1807, against the sturdy opposition of Virginia.†

In his "Genius of Universal Emancipation," Lundy says that there were in 1827 one hundred and thirty anti-slavery societies in the United States, with six thousand six hundred and twenty-five members. Of these, one hundred and six, with fifty-one hundred and fifty members, *were in the South.* According to Birney's "Life of Birney," about 2000 slaves were freed in North Carolina in 1824, 1825 and 1826. There was a colony of some three hundred free negroes within ten miles of where I was born. They had the right of suffrage till 1835, and, under the "Grandfather Clause" of our suffrage act of 1900, the descendants of the free negroes who voted before 1835 vote by inheritance now, just as the descendants of white voters before 1865 vote by inheritance, which fact makes the "Grandfather Clause" of our suffrage amendment impregnable.

But the most notable example of anti-slavery feeling in the South in those days was the election of a Legislature in Virginia in 1831 or 1832 after an able anti-slavery campaign. In this Legislature, the members "tied" on a bill for the gradual emancipation of all the slaves in Virginia, and the chairman, though he favored the bill, gave the casting vote against it, on the ground that a measure of such importance should not be undertaken unless a clear majority favored it. But about this time the abolition movement, inaugurated by Wm. Lloyd Garrison in Boston (the first fruits of which were the murder of sixty-one women and children in Southampton, Virginia, by Nat Turner and his associates), entirely changed the attitude of the South towards slavery, and of the one hundred and six anti-slavery societies which existed in the South in 1827, every one had disappeared by 1839. But for these unhappy events, a gradual emancipation policy, inaugurated by Southern people themselves, would probably have solved our black race problem. It thus appears that the people of the

* John Fiske: "The Critical Period of American History," page 72.
† *Ibid*, page 72.

South were protesting against the slave-trade, while the people of New England were actively engaged in it, and it is equally true that Garrison was, more than once, in imminent danger of his life at the hands of a Boston mob for his abolition sentiment about the time that Virginia was working out a scheme for gradual emancipation.

III.

When the Union was formed, there was no difference of opinion about the abstract right of secession.

The thirteen independent republics went into the Union voluntarily, as an experiment. Virginia claimed the right, *ipsissimis verbis,* to come out at will, and by tacit agreement the abstract right of secession was accorded to the other States. The right of withdrawal from the Union had been formally claimed seven times before 1860, once by South Carolina and six times in New England. In 1803, it was feared by New England that the Louisiana purchase would diminish the influence of their section of the Union; and Senator Pickering, of Massachusetts, strongly advocated the formation of a "Northern Confederacy." In 1807, Jefferson caused the repeal of the Embargo Act, because some of the New England States said that they would withdraw from the Union if the act was not repealed. In 1811, Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, protested against the admission of Louisiana, declaring that "the passage of the bill to admit Louisiana would be a dissolution of the Union," and that "it would be the right of all and the duty of some to prepare for a separation, peaceably, if they could, forcibly, if they must." In 1814, the people of New England met in convention at Hartford and withdrew from the Union, on account of their dissatisfaction with the management of the war with England and with the admission of Louisiana. But the war with Old England ended, and the war of New England against the other States was not begun. In 1844, the Legislature of Massachusetts passed an ordinance of secession, declaring that "the annexation of Texas tended to drive the States into a dissolution of the Union," and that "Massachusetts was determined to submit her undelegated powers to no body of men on earth;" and again, in 1848, Massachusetts nullified the Constitution by refusing to send a single soldier to uphold the flag in the war with Mexico. To these acts or threats of disunion by the people of New England before 1860, we may add that William

Lloyd Garrison's "Liberator," established in 1831 as the organ of the unconditional abolitionists, constantly took the ground that the Constitution was a "league with death and a covenant with hell," because it recognized the right to hold slaves; and the abolition of slavery was urged, although Mr. Garrison held that "slavery could be abolished only by the dissolution of the Union."

Thus, the people of New England asserted the right of secession in six special cases, before 1860. It was asserted constantly by the extreme abolitionists from 1831 to 1860. And, while the Republican Party suppressed secession in the United States of North America by armed intervention in 1861, the same Republican Party supported secession in one of the United States of South America by armed intervention in 1903.

IV.

Nor is it surprising that a belief in secession, as one of the reserved rights of the States, should have prevailed in the North as well as in the South before 1860, when we consider that the right of secession was distinctly taught at West Point up to about 1850. I have before me "Rawle on the Constitution," the text-book in which Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis studied the Constitution at the Government's Military Academy. In this book, the following language occurs:

"If a faction should attempt to subvert the government of a State for the purpose of destroying its republican form, the national power of the Union could be called forth to subdue it. Yet it is not to be understood that its interposition would be justifiable if a State should determine to retire from the Union" (p. 289). "It depends on the State itself whether it will continue a member of the Union. To deny this right would be inconsistent with the principle on which all our political systems are founded, which is, that the people have in all cases the right to determine how they shall be governed" (p. 289). "The States may then wholly withdraw from the Union" (p. 290). "If a majority of the people of a State deliberately and peaceably resolve to relinquish the republican form of government, they cease to be members of the Union" (p. 292). "The secession of a State from the Union depends on the will of the people of such State" (p. 295). "In any manner by which secession is to take place, nothing is more certain than that the act should be deliberate, clear and unequivocal" (p. 296). "The people of a State may have reason to complain in respect to acts of the general government; they may, in such cases, invest some of their own offices with the power of negotiation, and may declare an absolute

secession in case of failure. The secession in such cases must be distinctly and peremptorily declared to take place, and in such case, as the case of unconditional secession, the previous ligament with the Union would be legitimately and fairly destroyed" p. 296). "It was foreseen that there would be a natural tendency to increase the number of the States. It was also known that a State might withdraw itself" (p. 297). "To withdraw from the Union is a solemn, serious act." "Whenever it may appear expedient to the people of a State to withdraw from the Union, it must be manifested in a direct and unequivocal manner" (p. 298).

And the instruction given at West Point, from 1825 to 1850, as to the nature of personal allegiance, from "Rawle on the Constitution," is specially significant:

"This right (of secession) must be considered an ingredient in the original composition of the general government, and the doctrine heretofore presented in regard to the indefeasible nature of personal allegiance is so far qualified in respect to allegiance to the United States. It was observed that the reciprocal relations of protection and allegiance might cease in certain events, and it was further observed that allegiance would necessarily cease in case of the dissolution of the society (the Union, in that case) to which it was due" (pp. 289-290).

It thus appears that Robert E. Lee was taught by the United States Government at West Point that the Union was dissoluble, and that, if it should be dissolved, allegiance to the Union ceased, reverting to the States by which the Union had been created.

It is an historic fact that Jefferson Davis was not tried for treason, because, under the numerous States' rights decisions of Chief-Justice Chase, before he became Chief Justice, and under the States' rights instruction received at West Point from "Rawle on the Constitution," which was to be put in evidence if the trial had occurred, he could not have been convicted.

It would hasten the progress of harmony between the sections, if the people of the North would realize that the Confederates were neither rebels nor traitors, and that there were good, solid, historical and constitutional grounds for their acting as a matter of duty in 1861 on the belief that their patriotism should centre around the States rather than around the Union.

V.

It would hasten a better understanding between the sections if the people of the North would realize that the black race problem

is not our only race problem. Let us look calmly at the way in which the people of the North have dealt with their local race problems. They have practically exterminated the red man; and the remnant of the Indians who have not been slain have been set off in reservations, with entire disregard of their local and territorial rights; and even these are being opened to white men.

The yellow man, though inoffensive and industrious, has been slain by mobs on the Pacific Coast, and has been excluded from the soil of the United States by act of Congress at the dictation of white labor-unions of Northern people.

The territory of the brown man in the Hawaiian Islands has been annexed in the financial and political interests of white men, and an educational test for suffrage has been introduced, disfranchising many of the brown men in their own island, and all the yellow men (Chinese and Japanese), some thirty thousand in number, and about five thousand white Portuguese.

Furthermore, it is believed that thousands of the brown men in the Philippines have perished under methods of "benevolent assimilation" practised there. With such sins against the red man, the yellow man and the brown man to be answered for wholly or chiefly by the people of the North, does it not seem strange for the people of the North to find so much fault with the Southern treatment of the black man, when, as a matter of fact, he has not only been conserved, but he has made such rapid progress from savagery, and in some cases at least from cannibalism, in about two centuries that the people of the North deemed him worthy to share in the citizenship of the Great Republic?

VI.

An historic study of the ballot by our Northern fellow citizens would tend to hasten the progress of a better understanding.

By the Constitution of the United States, and of every State in the Union, the ballot is not a right, but a privilege to be extended by those who have it to those they deem worthy of it.

The people of the North, not deeming the Indian worthy of the ballot, exclude all red men from it. Not deeming Chinese worthy of the ballot, they exclude all yellow men, not only from the ballot, but from the country.

Not deeming the brown man worthy of manhood suffrage, in 1900 a Republican Congress passed a bill, which was signed by a Republican President, excluding a large number of brown men

from the ballot in their own Island of Hawaii, and turning the island over to the white men. Not deeming all white men worthy of manhood suffrage, the people of the North have excluded illiterate white men from the ballot. In some of the Northern States, literacy and a certain amount of property are made the condition of manhood suffrage. We of the South think that this limited suffrage, as enforced by the North, is just and right, and, if it is necessary in the North with comparatively so few illiterates, it is a hundredfold more necessary in the South. And yet the people of the North have discriminated in favor of all the black men in the South, though racially inferior in achievement in all the past to the other colored races who remain disfranchised.

By degrees the Anglo-Saxon people in the South who fought in the Civil War have regained by legislation what they lost against overwhelming odds "in the deadly imminent breach," and have confined the ballot to those whom they deem worthy of it, though less rigidly than it is confined in New England.

Becoming convinced that the legislation of the reconstruction period was hasty, ill-advised and partisan, Congress has repealed some of it; the Supreme Court has annulled some of it, as being unconstitutional; and the consensus of opinion at the North seems to be to relegate the whole matter of suffrage in the Southern, as in the Northern, States to the intelligent people of each State. It would hasten the removal of the misunderstandings between the sections, if the suffrage amendment should share the fate of most of the other reconstruction legislation.

VII.

It would help to harmonize the sections, if Northern people would reflect that what they call "race prejudice" is not peculiar to the South. We discriminate against the negro politically. We must preserve our political integrity. We discriminate against him socially. We must preserve our own race integrity. In the whole North about one-sixtieth of the population is of African blood. In the whole South nearly one-half of the population is of African blood. In some of the Southern States, three-fifths are negroes, and in localities in all or nearly all of the Southern States nine-tenths of the people are negroes. A weak solution and a saturated solution of a drug must be handled differently. But while we must exercise political control over the African

man and must reject social relations with him, economically the negro is not discriminated against anywhere in the South, as he is everywhere in the North. If a contractor anywhere in the North had twenty white carpenters and twenty white bricklayers employed, and were to add five negro carpenters and five negro bricklayers to his force, his white workmen would stop working at once, nor would they allow the black men to do the work. Some years ago, I employed a contractor to do some building for me and he put about twenty-five white men and about twenty-five negroes on the work. White and black carpenters, bricklayers, painters and common laborers worked together in the greatest harmony at the same wages for the same sort of work. This could not have occurred in New England. Negroes got higher wages than white men for the same work if they were better workmen. This could not have occurred in Illinois or Ohio. And white men and black men, with wages graded by skill and not by race, worked in perfect harmony under my contractor's negro foreman or "boss carpenter." This could not have occurred in any Northern State. In the South, white men and negroes may not eat together; but not eating with a white man does not affect a black man's supply of food or his digestion. In the North white men and negroes may eat together in many public places, at least, and some negroes may eat with some white people in private. But negroes and white men may not work together in the North; and this economic discrimination against the negro strikes, not at his political relations, not at his social relations, but at his chance to get food and clothing, except in such occupations as white men do not want. Our discrimination against the negro politically and socially is race *instinct,* which is minimized in the North on account of the very weak "solution," so to speak, of negroes in the North, and is maximized in the South because of our "saturated solution" of negroes. But the economic prejudice against the negro in the North is race *prejudice,* and it strikes not only at his means of living, but at his life itself. Of the negro miners who went from Alabama to Illinois during Governor Tanner's administration, quite a number were slain, and the rest were driven from the State; and the Governor of President Lincoln's own State, and a member of President Lincoln's own political party, said that, if any more negro laborers started to Illinois, he would meet them on the border with Gatling guns. And it is

significant that not one of the murderers of these innocent and industrious laborers has ever been brought to justice.

VIII.

Again, a great deal is said about the people of the South lynching negroes. It would help to remove the bitterness against the South among Northern people on this score if they would realize two facts about themselves in the matter of mob violence. The first is that the statistics show that more negroes have been put to death by mobs in the North, in proportion to the negro population, than in the South; and, though public sentiment in the North seems to be very strong in favor of punishing as murderers those who engage in lynching in the South, yet grand juries in the North, with public sentiment ostensibly overwhelmingly in their favor, very rarely, if ever, find true bills against such murderers. The same is true of those who slew so many of the Chinese on the Pacific Coast and drove the remainder from the country.

The other thing which our Northern fellow citizens would do well to realize in connection with lynching, is the fact that, when we anticipate the law and put a negro to death for the new negro crime, the violence, which should never have occurred, stops with the criminal. Innocent negroes are never molested. But in the North the violence only begins with the mobbing of the criminal, and it continues by slaying innocent and inoffensive negroes, by destroying their property, and by driving them from their homes and their counties. This violence of race prejudice was exhibited in the anti-negro riots in New York city recently, in the anti-negro riots in Wilmington, Delaware, and in Acron and Urbana, Ohio, President McKinley's own State, in Evansville, Indiana, President Harrison's own State, in Illinois, President Lincoln's own State, and in many other Northern States. If the better element in these communities were as anxious to suppress lynching and punish lynchers at home as they are to suppress lynching and punish lynchers in the South, some of their own lawbreakers would have been brought to justice.

IX.

It would help to harmonize the sections if the Northern people would realize how much we did for the industrial education of the negro before 1865, how much we have done for his educa-

tion in books since 1865. In 1867 the people of the North conferred unrestricted manhood suffrage on all the black men in the Southern States. The blacks in the South composed nearly half of our population, and the injection of such a mass of illiterates into our citizenship was a great menace to the civilization, not only of the South, but of the whole country. But the red men, the yellow men, the illiterate black men and the illiterate white men in the Northern States, composing their disfranchised, aggregated all combined, so unappreciable a proportion of *their* population as to be not the slightest menace to them; and yet they were disfranchised and the negro in the South was enfranchised. Having made the great mistake against this child race of conferring the ballot on the negro with absolutely no training in self-government, they made no appropriation of funds to be used in preparing him for the intelligent use of the ballot. His training in citizenship was left to benevolent enthusiasts in the North and to the impoverished white people in the South. The benevolent enthusiasts seemed to act on the belief that the African man is an Anglo-Saxon in a black skin, and that mere book learning would soon relieve him of his African disabilities. And so, in direct opposition to the methods of General Armstrong at Hampton and of Booker Washington at Tuskegee, they put as much as twenty-five million dollars into showy piles of brick and stone and mortar, in various parts of the South, in "colleges" and "universities," where this infant of civilization might receive higher learning in the humanities, the sciences and theology, no provision being made for giving him the elementary training on which all higher education must be built.

We of the South feel that the motives of the philanthropists were good, but that their methods were defective in the quality of the education offered; and that they were unfortunate in their discrimination against the whites of the South, the two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars investment made by the Northern Presbyterian Church on the Asheville Plateau for the uplifting of our poor white boys and girls, being the only investment of the kind in the Southern States. This discrimination, educationally, against the whites and in favor of the negro, has tended to make the race feeling of our non-slave-holding class less latent and less quiescent; and unless the best, the most thoughtful and most intelligent people of both sections unite against this rising

tide of race feeling in the non-slave-holding whites against the blacks, the attitude of the white laborers in the South will become what it has already become in the North towards the negro.

As Northern philanthropists provided only for the higher education of the negro, and as the Government made no provision whatever for him educationally, the Southern people in their poverty undertook the work as best they could. I believe it is safe to say that, at the close of the Civil War, we were the poorest people in the civilized world. We staked everything on the decision of the sword and lost, and we had nothing on which to rebuild our shattered fortunes but the ground we stood on. Nevertheless, we assumed the imperative duty of educating the negro, taxing ourselves to the constitutional limit for public schools, and dividing the proceeds of tax money *pro rata* among our own children and the children of the blacks, who have never up to this day paid more than five per cent. of the taxes, and who used the ballot against us with a steady and persistent hostility, which would not have been tolerated by employers in employees for a single year anywhere else in the world, and least of all in New England. When we reached the constitutional limit of taxation for public schools for whites and blacks alike, we introduced "local option" taxation in almost every county in the South, and divided the increased proceeds of taxation *pro rata* between the children of both races. Bills were introduced into the Legislatures of several States, now controlled by white people, to appropriate to the schools for the negroes only what the taxes on their property produced; but in every case these bills were voted down by overwhelming majorities of white men. In this spirit, the South, in its impoverished condition, has paid One Hundred and Twenty Million Dollars of tax money for the education of negro children, though our own children were crying to us for educational bread, and we could get them little better than a stone. In addition to this, we established normal schools for their teachers, schools for their blind, schools for their mutes and asylums for their insane, all from the proceeds of taxes paid to the extent of from ninety-five per cent. to ninety-eight per cent. by white people; and, in addition, we have established several theological schools for the education of their preachers by private benevolence. In short, we have adopted these neglected wards of the Nation, and have made them the foster-brothers and

sisters educationally of our own children. And yet, many Northern papers and many Northern people can see nothing but oppression and cruelty in our dealings with the black man since we delivered him over to the Nation in 1865, orderly, fairly industrious, without vices, without disease and without crime, and worthy, in the estimation of the people of the North, to share in the citizenship of the Republic. But, in spite of our vast outlay on him, in proportion to our resources, in the hands of the Nation he has become disorderly, idle, vicious and diseased; and, according to the Census, three times more criminal, hundred for hundred, than the native whites, one and one-half times more criminal than the foreign whites, three times more criminal in the Northeast, where he has not been a slave for a hundred years, and three and a half times more criminal in the Northwest where he was never a slave, than in the South. The most discouraging features of these revelations of the Census are: (1), that his maximum criminality and his minimum illiteracy concur in New England; and (2), according to the Census, that more than seven-tenths of the negro criminals are under thirty years of age. This result of the Nation's dealing with the negro since 1865, as compared with our dealing with him before 1865, must convince reasonable people at the North that, in dealing with the negro, the Nation has made a mistake in some way; and that this mistake must be corrected somehow.

X.

And, lastly, it would help harmonize the sections if all Americans would keep in mind that the war and its unhappy sequences belong to the history of sectional America, and that the peace, power and glory of our future can be attained, and can be maintained, only by National America. Every man in both armies knows that the Americans who met on the field were to each other "the enemy" only in the technical, military sense, but they were never enemies. The thousands and thousands of kindnesses between Confederate and Federal, even on the firing-line when the firing was suspended, on the picket-line and among the dead and dying, show that the men on both sides who were at the front were there from a sense of duty and not because they loved war, or because they did not love each other. And when Lee's thin, ragged skirmish-line stacked their arms for the last time at Appomattox Court-House, the solemnity of a funeral prevailed,

and I saw tears of sympathy and pity streaming from the eyes of the Federal soldiers who stood in line on each side of us.

When President Johnson and Secretary Stanton, in order to "punish traitors and make treason odious," issued the order to General Grant to arrest all the Confederate officers through the rank of Colonel, that they might be convicted by a drumhead court martial and put to death, General Grant looked into their faces and said: "You will have to whip me and my army before one hair of one head of the men whom we captured, and whom I promised protection to, shall perish." And the spirit of sectional America quailed before the spirit of National America. But in an evil day the politicians arose, who had kept resolutely away from the firing-line; and the reconstruction period followed, a period of depression, of repression, of suppression and of oppression. It has taken the people of the North nearly forty years to get something like the true perspective on this period. But leading men of the North have now begun to discuss it clearly and strongly.

While waiting patiently and hopefully for the spirit of National America, the people of the South did not wait idly. We rebuilt our shattered fortunes as only men of Anglo-Saxon blood can rebuild, and we restored our political supremacy.

We shall do all that we can to continue the education of the African man along the line of his capabilities. We shall restrain his suffrage, but only as New England restrains the suffrage of white men. After 1908, the same qualifications for suffrage shall be applied to his children and to ours; and these qualifications are less rigid than those applied to white men in New England; but, having been dominated by him from 1867 to 1876, we shall not allow his political liberty to degenerate again into political license.

The evil spirit of sectional America is being exorcized as the years of the new century come and go. And our Race Questions, and all other questions which may arise, may be safely committed, by a combined New North, New South, New East, New West, to the New National America, which has become so great and so strong in the present, and which will become still greater and still stronger in the degree in which we all become more and more unitedly animated by the spirit of National Americans.

ROBERT BINGHAM.

LEGAL SUPERVISION OF THE TRANSPORTATION TAX.

BY BROOKS ADAMS.

PROBABLY no one ever disputed the importance of superior communications; but thoroughfares are costly, and men have differed as to how their cost should be met. In transportation there are three chief items of expense: first, police protection for the traveller; second, construction and maintenance of the way; third, motive power, the vehicle, and the labor for operation. This outlay may be provided for by a tax on articles in transit, or by a levy on the whole community, or by a combination of both methods; but, down to the introduction of steam, the state rather tended to assume the burden, in order to equalize the contribution paid by the individual toward facilitating movement.

The primitive family is nearly self-sufficing; and, when exchanges are few, differences in the price of carriage do not work a drastic discrimination between localities. As circulation quickens, towns grow, industries multiply and specialize, and presently the item of freight becomes a prevailing factor in the success or ruin of individuals and cities.

Hence, tolls have been a fruitful source of revolution, and were one of the chief grievances which agitated the French in 1789. Clearly, where discrimination exists in the transportation tax, there oppression must prevail; for he who pays more than his neighbor to reach his market must, other things being equal, to that extent, be shorn of profit.

Under Louis XVI., the district tributary to Bordeaux was laid waste by exactions at the terminus, and Bordeaux's policy was not the exception but the rule. An urban community in America imports all necessaries, hence a discriminating railway rate affects the whole scale of living.

Experience has proved competition to be sharp enough without artificial aids, and men somewhat early had their attention drawn to the necessity of protecting the weak against the strong. One effort in this direction was the organization of a police to protect the traveller, instead of leaving him to arm himself, or to buy from those who bore arms. Another experiment was the maintenance of the way by society at large, instead of allowing some soldier to do the road-mending and compensate himself by fees for passage. At any rate, until steam came in, the individual might always provide his own vehicle and motor. With railways, that privilege ceased.

The progression is written upon every page of history. Standing armies cannot exist without industries and commerce, because farming communities, far from markets, have no surplus to spend for the soldier's wages. Hence, simple societies rely upon militia serving for short terms, and such a militia is worthless for siege operations. Therefore, after the fifth century, when exchanges almost ceased in the West, sovereignty, in the Roman sense, also ceased. He who could build a tower was a king, for he could not be coerced; and these tower-builders became the feudal nobles, whose privileges bore an exact ratio to the sum the nation could spend on police. In the tenth century, when industry fell lowest, the nobles culminated, and they charged what they pleased for the use of the ways. When, in the thirteenth century, manufacturing flourished, the nobles lost ground. Under opulent princes, like Saint Louis, a baron was held to his promise like any contractor.

Many processes are recorded. Among others, certain merchants of Berry in 1269, complained to Parliament that they had been robbed within the jurisdiction of the Lord of Vierzon, after payment for passage; and that noble was ordered to restore to the complainants the property which had been taken from them. In practice, however, in spite of supervision, the exaction of tolls by private individuals or corporations proved so unsatisfactory that many nations tried to give relief by constructing national thoroughfares. Colbert established several. The Canal of Languedoc, connecting the ocean with the Mediterranean, was built, by his advice, partly by the Crown and partly by the province. Finished in 1681, it long remained the engineering masterpiece of Europe.

The English neglected applied science until the middle of the

eighteenth century, and the government, when improved communications became a necessity, were incompetent to act. Consequently, individuals and companies obtained charters from Parliament authorizing them to build canals and turnpikes; but, as the tolls were also provided for in the charters, the interests of the public were supposed to be guaranteed. Nevertheless, the turnpike system was abandoned, while canals have lost importance because of railways.

Thus, when toward 1800 the United States began to expand with vigor, two methods offered for raising funds for thoroughfares. The Government might become proprietor, and pay the cost out of general revenue or by a system of tolls established by law; or the people might farm out to individuals the privilege of collecting the transportation tax for their own benefit, in consideration of providing the way. At the outset, government ownership commended itself. In 1808, Gallatin, as Secretary of the Treasury, recommended a system of communications to be opened between Maine and Georgia and between the Atlantic and the Mississippi. In 1806, Congress made an appropriation for the Cumberland Road; in 1825, John Quincy Adams, in his Annual Message, advocated internal improvements; while, in the same year, New York finished the Erie Canal, which, considering the resources available and the results produced, may, perhaps, deserve to rank as the most remarkable highway ever completed in America. Indeed, its wonderful success directly led to the reversal of what was then the national policy. Stimulated by New York, Pennsylvania plunged into a disastrous speculation.

As managers of private corporations, Americans have succeeded; but, when administering the States or the Nation, they have done less well, and nowhere has this characteristic been more visible than in Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Railroad rose to eminence in achieving the task which made the State insolvent. Between 1824 and 1842, the Commonwealth spent above $53,000,000 on thoroughfares which yielded no adequate return. In 1842, it suspended interest on its debt; and, in 1857, it gladly sold the property to the Pennsylvania Railroad for $7,500,000. Pennsylvania's misadventure practically ended experiments at State ownership, and thenceforward individuals assumed the administration of the railways, pretty much free from national supervision. The reason for this apparent apathy toward the public

interests was twofold. In the first place, when railways were introduced, they were so keenly desired that the people were ready to concede almost anything to obtain them; and, besides, for the United States to interfere with State corporations was a delicate matter fifty years ago. But, in the second place, toward the middle of the last century, men were dominated by certain theories of so-called political economy, among others that of the value of free competition to correct social ills. Applying this theory to railways, the inference was drawn that the average citizen would fare best in regard to transportation if railways were left to fight for existence among themselves.

Now, it seems evident that free competition means the destruction of the unfit and the survival of the strong. Possibly, it may be abstractly good that the feeble should perish, but, if pushed too far, the process may be dangerous. This has become clear to us, but it was not clear to the last generation, and for a time all went well.

Local companies issued stock and built short sections of road; and, as long as the adjacent population elected the directors, managements fostered the interests of those who lived along their lines. As competition worked, these conditions changed; and, as rates were cut at junctions, the companies, following the path of least resistance, transferred the burden of their tax from those who could escape them to those who could not.

A purchaser who can select his vendor can contract, but a purchaser who has no choice is subject to a servitude. For example, the French peasants had no choice as to where they should grind their corn. That they had to grind it at the lord's mill was a servitude. In like manner, a population with access to but one railway is subject to a servitude. It cannot escape the tax imposed upon it, unless it can obtain relief from a court.

The man who lives at the junction of several lines, on the contrary, may choose, his patronage being of value in proportion to the tonnage he offers. He who ships little will obtain small concessions, he who ships much will obtain large. Thus, the opulent shippers at the chief junctions became a favored class in regard to rates, and the junctions themselves became favored towns in proportion to the ferocity of the competition waged at them.

Competition worked similar results among the roads. Initial roads were constrained to control the whole line to the terminal

which served as their vent, else they might be throttled by an adversary. Thus, the strongest link in the chain absorbed the others, the stock passing from the neighborhood to magnates at terminals. In this way, an absentee ownership was created, and absentee owners always tend to ignore local complaints, as long as revenue remains satisfactory. Territory had also to be defended and feeders protected, and gradually the modern railway system came into being, covering vast areas, employing many thousand men, and wielding an arbitrary power over all the population living between junctions, with only the one outlet to the world.

This intermediate population not only could not escape, but could obtain no redress, while the dwellers at the junction could impose terms. Yet money for dividends had to be raised. As always happens the weak bore the burden.

> "For why? Because the good old rule
> Sufficeth them; the simple plan,
> That they should take who have the power,
> And they should keep who can."

Yet, in spite of taxing their intermediate country "all its traffic would bear," the trunk lines saw their revenues shrinking because of rate cutting at terminals, and they accordingly resorted to pooling.

The pooling contract amounts to an agreement among roads connecting the same cities to divide receipts according to a fixed percentage, and to do the work in common. Under such an arrangement, the inducement to underbid for tonnage is supposed to be eliminated, as each member's share of the pool is established beforehand. But where pooling begins, rebates and preferences should end, and here was the rock on which pooling split. Pooling is hated by magnates who obtain secret preferences which enable them to market their goods at a cost which ruins small concerns. Accordingly, pooling was denounced as a crime against the public who should enjoy free competition. Finally, a sort of commercial anarchy came to prevail, and discontent drove Congress in 1887 to pass an "Act to Regulate Commerce," of which hopes were formed which have not been realized.

The statute, being the resultant of conflicting forces, contained contradictory principles. While to gratify the lesser shippers,

preferences were forbidden, to pacify the great, pooling was forbidden as well. Hence, competition, while on one side condemned, was on the other enforced. In like manner, the intermediate country sought protection by a clause which made it illegal to charge more for goods carried a lesser than for those carried a greater distance. The railways tried to neutralize this clause by a rider providing that the restriction should be inoperative unless the traffic complained of should be done under "substantially similar circumstances and conditions." Lastly, Congress created a Commission to carry the act into effect, omitting to define precisely its powers. Such a statute was capable of different interpretations. It might be construed as limiting competition, protecting the intermediate country, discouraging preferences, and creating an effective board of arbitration to stand between the public and the corporations; or it might be considered as hardly more than declaratory of existing law, and as giving the Commission nothing by implication. The railways sustained the latter thesis, and convinced the majority of the Supreme Court. In effect, the judiciary threw its weight in favor of unlimited competition, and by so doing, for most practical purposes, annulled the statute. In The Alabama Midland *vs.* The Interstate Com. Com., Mr. Justice Harlan thus summed up the situation:

"The Commission was established to protect the public against the improper practices of transportation companies engaged in commerce among the several States. It has been left, it is true, with power to make reports, and to issue protests. But it has been shorn, by judicial interpretation, of authority to do anything of an effective character. It is denied many of the powers, which, in my judgment, were intended to be conferred upon it. Besides, the acts of Congress are now so construed as to place communities on the lines of interstate commerce at the mercy of competing railway companies engaged in such commerce."

The facts support this statement of the learned justice, for the first step of the bench was to set aside the long and short haul clause, the next to eviscerate the Commission. A test case soon arose over export rates which settled the fate of the intermediate country.

In April, 1888, the New York Produce Exchange complained that the trunk lines charged one rate on goods consigned from Chicago to New York for domestic use, and a less rate, sometimes

one-half, for like goods when intended for export. The complainants asked that rates to New York should be equalized, and that discrimination in favor of exports should be suppressed. The New York Central favored the complainants, the Pennsylvania did not stubbornly oppose. The Commission found that the statute covered the case, and ordered the practice to cease. Most Eastern companies complied with this order: but, among others, the Texas and Pacific declined to do so, whereupon the Commission filed a bill in the Circuit Court to compel obedience.

Before the Circuit Court much new evidence was adduced. It was proved, among other things, that it cost 288 cents to transport 100 lbs. of books, carpets, and many such commodities from New Orleans to San Francisco, and only 107 cents to carry a like weight of the same articles, when on land in the same train, from London to San Francisco.

Admitting these facts, the railways contended that the competition of ships and of Canadian routes had so reduced freights to and from the Pacific, that, if they declined to accept the same scale, the business would leave the United States. This competition, they alleged, made the conditions under which transportation went on between foreign countries and Pacific ports dissimilar to the conditions which prevailed between American towns, and therefore they urged that the clause in the statute which forbade charging the greater sum for the shorter distance was inoperative. The Circuit Court and the Circuit Court of Appeals sustained the Commission, but the Supreme Court reversed these judgments. Forthwith, every carrier in the Union considered the long and short haul clause as annulled.

The companies next attacked the power of the Commission to adjust rates, and here, too, they succeeded even beyond expectation. In Interstate Com. Com. *vs.* Cin., N. O. & Texas Pac.,* the Court held that Congress had not given the Commission power to prescribe rates, either directly or indirectly. In the case of the Alabama Midland, the whole subject was reargued, and the principle of competition carried out logically. The Court there decided that the existence of competition at any point may be considered in the making of domestic rates, and that, where competition creates dissimilarity of conditions, the roads may charge more for the shorter than for longer distance.

* 167 U. S., 479.

From this judgment Mr. Justice Harlan dissented, prophetically observing that the position taken by the Court might "well be regarded as recognizing the authority of competing railroad companies, . . . when their interests will be subserved thereby, to build up favored centres of population at the expense of the business of the country at large."*

Mr. Justice Harlan proved to be right. Mr. Smith, president of the Louisville & Nashville, has steadily insisted that railways are private enterprises to be run for the profit of owners. He has hesitated neither to put his theories into practice nor to defend them before the courts. Finding it profitable, he placed prohibitory rates on the staple commodities of his country seeking a vent through Savannah, in order to encourage Pensacola, where his company had a monopoly. He made the pay of his freight-agents depend on the quantity of freight diverted from Savannah, and he avowed the principle that a railway might make money as best it could by favoring its own.† The presiding judge, while admitting that, under the precedents, favoritism might be carried to a reasonable extent, thought interdiction of intercourse unjustifiable. How the Supreme Court would have ruled is uncertain, for Mr. Smith did not appeal.

In the Alabama Midland case, the Court decided that domestic competition might create such dissimilarity of circumstances as would justify the larger charge for the shorter distance, but did not specify precisely of what character such competition must be. In this doubt many towns, thinking themselves aggrieved, asked for relief; and, of these cases, perhaps the two most celebrated were those of Danville and Chattanooga. Danville had 20,000 inhabitants. The Southern absorbed all the lines there centring, and then charged higher rates than to more distant terminals. Among these, Lynchburg, Danville's rival, sixty-six miles distant, lay on the Chesapeake & Ohio which obeyed the statute. The Southern also entered Lynchburg. For freight carried sixty-six miles less, Danville annually paid the Southern $50,000 more than Lynchburg paid upon the same quality and weight of goods. Thereby, the Commission found, Lynchburg might "annihilate" Danville. But the courts sustained the Southern in making low rates to Lynchburg and earning its dividends from Danville.

* 168 U. S., 177.

† Interstate Com. Com. *vs.* Louisville & Nashville, 118 Fed. Rep., 618.

The Chattanooga case went farther. The Commission found Chattanooga to be 151 miles nearer New York than Nashville, and to be connected with Nashville by the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis, the majority of whose stock was owned by the Louisville & Nashville. The L. & N. also connected Nashville with New York; and, to favor Nashville, the L. & N. gave it rates averaging, perhaps, 40 per cent. less than the rates to Chattanooga.

To meet this alleged competition the Chattanooga & St. Louis, the property of the L. & N., pretended that it must make equally cheap rates through Chattanooga to Nashville, so that a car-load of first-class freight from New York cost the Chattanooga jobber $456, and the same freight hauled in the same train cost the Nashville jobber, 151 miles farther off, $364, the Nashville merchant being thus enabled to undersell his Chattanooga rival, so to speak, on his own doorstep.

Judge Taft, in the Circuit Court of Appeals, held that genuine competition could not exist between the Louisville & Nashville and its chattel, the Chattanooga & St. Louis, and that the arrangement was a contrivance of the L. & N. to give Nashville an illegal preference, while exacting an unreasonable tax from Chattanooga.* The Supreme Court reversed this judgment.

Finally, to ascertain if a case could be presented which would hold under the long and short haul clause, the Commission selected the petition of one Calloway. Calloway was an inhabitant of La Grange in Georgia. La Grange lies seventy-one miles nearer New Orleans than does Atlanta, the terminal. Goods from New Orleans for Atlanta pass through La Grange. La Grange is on the Atlanta & West Point, one of the links of the line from Atlanta to New Orleans, a system of which the Louisville & Nashville forms a part. Hogansville, Fairburn and other towns lie between La Grange and Atlanta. The policy of the L. & N. in regard to its intermediate country is to take the terminal rate as the basis, and then add to this rate the local rate back to the point of destination. Thus on 100 lbs. of first-class goods sent from New Orleans to Atlanta, the Atlanta jobber paid $1 03. The citizen of Fairburn paid the rate to Atlanta, $1 03, *plus* eighteen miles back toward New Orleans, or $1 25 in all. Calloway paid $1 03 for the 495 miles haul from New Orleans to Atlanta, *plus* the local back toward New Orleans for 71 miles, or $1 43 in all.

* 99 Fed. Rep., 63.

Neither the La Grange, nor any intermediate, freight went to Atlanta, but was delivered in its natural order. The Commission found the cost of the so-called local service, which was most of the way conducted in through trains, did not materially exceed the cost of through service; yet the habit of the roads was to haul freight to Atlanta, deliver it, receive it again, load it, carry it back to La Grance and redeliver it, to compete with direct deliveries to Calloway. Thus, the principle of taxing the helpless country was to increase the charge in proportion as the work done diminished. La Grange paid 38 per cent. more than Atlanta, though Atlanta lay 71 miles farther off, and the rule held good for Hogansville, Fairburn and, indeed, all places which had no means of defence.

It was suggested that competition at Atlanta might have forced rates to so low a point that, though the rates to La Grange seemed relatively high, they were in reality cheap. In answer, Calloway proved that the average revenue per ton per mile received by the Louisville & Nashville south of the Ohio, was 8.28 mills; that the first-class rate to Atlanta yielded over 4.17 cents per ton per mile, and to La Grange 38 per cent. more, or about 5.75 cents.

Such tariffs are remunerative, as the condition of the Atlanta & West Point indicated. It appeared that the road had always defrayed the cost of improvements from earnings; also that, in 1881, it had declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent., and ever since, both on the old shares and the water, had paid 6 per cent. annually, or 12 per cent. on the original capital. The president explained that this was legitimate, as the rates of the road had been legal, and the owners, instead of caring for the property, might have taken all for themselves. In other words, he sustained the thesis that the public has no more right to control a railway than a grocery.

Supposing this doctrine conceded, Calloway easily showed that business could only be conducted in La Grange by favor of the railway, since the company could tax any trade out of existence. The Commission found as a fact that jobbers in La Grange were so taxed. Calloway, "as compared with his Atlanta competitor, is at a disadvantage in all the section to the north of La Grange, and in La Grange the Atlanta dealer can sell as cheaply as complainant can."

Upon this evidence, the Commission held the railway rates

from New Orleans to La Grange to be both "unjust and unreasonable in themselves, and as compared with their rates . . . to Atlanta."* On appeal, the Supreme Court reversed this ruling, Mr. Justice White intimating that he did not consider that the Commission had found the La Grange rates to be unreasonable in themselves, but only relatively unreasonable as compared with others which were competitive.

Until corrected by Mr. Justice White, the Commission supposed that they had expressly decided this point;† but their error was immaterial. Neither are judicial reservations of much moment. The decree is the essence. When relief is denied under certain admitted facts, men believe that, whatever judges may say, their decision is fixed, and in this instance both the public and the corporations considered that the courts had determined to give over the intermediate country to the railways. The long and short haul clause was abrogated; one hope only remained, that possibly the bench on further argument might construe the phrase "reasonable rates" more favorably for the public in the future than in the past.

Railway magnates were, however, inclined to jest at resistance. Counsel were persuaded that the judiciary would always allow the carriers ample discretion in the imposition of rates; while presidents freely said that they could prevent distasteful legislation. When the implied approval, in the La Grange case, of the device of stock-watering to halve a twelve-per-cent. dividend is coupled with the results reached in Smyth *vs.* Ames, the confidence of the lawyers seems not irrational. In Smyth *vs.* Ames the litigation arose over a Nebraska statute intended to remedy an alleged discrimination. The Nebraskans felt aggrieved because rates within their State were higher than those in adjoining States. Particularly it was averred that the Iowa schedules were 40 per cent. lower. Nebraska proposed to equalize matters by a reduction of about 29½ per cent. in local tariffs. The railways set up confiscation, contending that, on the basis proposed, local expenses would exceed local revenue. The Attorney-General offered to show that through business would yield good dividends even were local business done at cost, but that local business would not be done at cost but by a profit, since it would increase with cheaper trans-

* 7 I. C. R., 453.

† Interstate Com. Com. Report for 1898, page 32.

portation. The judges declined to be convinced, and sustained the carriers' contention that the act amounted to an attempt at local confiscation, though the companies, on the whole, might pay handsomely. In this connection, it is to be remembered that, within three years, Mr. Hill bought the Burlington, one of the threatened roads, for $200 a share, thus fixing on the State forever the burden of paying interest on 100 per cent. of water for which the people receive no consideration.

Incidentally, the courts had so construed the clauses forbidding rebates and preferences as to make them ineffective. Thus, it appears that toward 1900 the carriers had achieved a commanding position. They had broken down the protection which the Interstate Commerce Act was supposed to give the intermediate country, and they had won, with but one exception, every important case in which their rates had been challenged, when they had appealed to the Supreme Court. It only remained for them to gain control at the terminals to be, in substance, autocratic. The Sherman Act forbidding combinations in restraint of trade was the obstacle to be surmounted; for that statute, as interpreted, covered contracts between rival lines made to suppress competition. Various traffic agreements differing from ordinary pooling were tried and held bad, and, finally, merger seemed the only method left by which the object could be accomplished. In merger eminent counsel felt confidence, a confidence based upon the conviction that the Supreme Court could never be brought to affirm that a man may not invest his money as he pleases, provided the enterprise itself be lawful. The legislature might as well prohibit, said they, the purchase of two groceries, or of two house lots. If merger should prove to be a restraint of trade, it would be time to interfere when an overt act could be alleged.

Accepting these opinions, Mr. Hill prepared to merge the Burlington, the Northern Pacific, and the Great Northern. After a memorable struggle, Mr. Morgan acquired the stock; and then he and Mr. Hill proceeded to organize a holding company to cover the system. Thereupon the Northwest revolted and the President intervened. Obviously cause existed for alarm. Mr. Hill's merger reduced under one ownership all the practicable highways traversing a region half as large as western Europe, and a cursory reference to the adjudications will show the power which such a combination could exercise over the population subject to it.

Operating three roads in fact, though not in name, Mr. Hill could create technical competition at will. Chattanooga had been the victim of technical competition; for, when Chattanooga showed that the two roads said to be competing at Nashville, and thereby giving Nashville a preference of some forty per cent. in rates from New York, were actually owned by the same interest, the Supreme Court had not deemed this fact material.* The effect of this decision might be incalculable; for, wherever such peculiar competition could be proved, the power of the railways seemed to be without limit either as to the amount or the distribution of their taxation. The books teem with cases; but Danville and La Grange must serve for the present purpose.

In Danville, every pound of raw material, every manufactured article, every ton of coal, cost more than in Lynchburg. Yet it was admitted that the Southern lost no money by its Lynchburg schedule. "The difference in freight rates alone would afford a fair profit upon many manufacturing enterprises."† Mr. Culp, the manager of the Southern, was asked "what weight he gave to the interest of the city of Danville, to its proximity to Lynchburg, to the fact that it was a competitor of Lynchburg, and his reply in effect was, None."

But the Southern contended that on $120,000,000 of common stock, which had been issued as water at the reorganization, the road paid no dividends, and insisted that any order which tended to deplete revenue, amounted to confiscation of this stock.‡ Danville languished, and the Commission tried to give Danville relief, but the order of the Commission was reversed.§

In the Chattanooga case, the Louisville & Nashville, in the words of Judge Taft, alleged its "fostering care of Nashville" as a reason for giving that town a preference; and, when Chattanooga complained that because of this preference Nashville could undersell her at her own door, the defendant railroad set up competition at Nashville as the cause, although all the schedules were arranged by managers who obeyed Mr. Smith. To all intents and purposes, the two corporations formed one road, precisely as

* See opinion of Taft, J., in East Tenn. Ry. *vs.* Interstate Com. Com., 99 Fed. Rep., 63, reversed 181 U. S., 1.

† City of Danville *vs.* Southern Ry. Co., 8 I. C. R., 421.

‡ City of Danville *vs.* Southern Ry. Co., 8 I. C. R., 583, 584.

§ 122 Fed. Rep., 800.

Mr. Hill's three roads were to form one. Towns so situated appeared to have no rights which could be enforced in the courts. Calloway at La Grange showed that, by taxation, the railroad left him the option of abandoning his trade or his home; and that, though the through rates sufficed to earn six per cent. on the genuine stock of the Atlanta & West Point, other six per cent. was raised by arbitrary taxation from the intermediate country. Yet Calloway lost his cause. Taken together, the La Grange case and Smyth *vs.* Ames were believed to indicate that any proposition which threatened to curtail dividends would meet with no favor from the tribunal of last resort, and though, out of deference to proprieties, it might be well to keep the nominal dividend low by stock-watering, that in practice profits would be protected.

Thus many inhabitants of the vast region covered by Mr. Hill's combination had reason to fear, were he to consummate his scheme, that no industry could thrive, no town could even develop its street-railways, no port could count on merchandise to ship, no immigrant could settle on the land, no farmer could sell his crop, save at Mr. Hill's pleasure. In fine, were this merger to stand, in substance, the income of several millions of citizens would be the residue left them after the combination had helped itself. Had the people been assured that the burden, however heavy, would have been evenly distributed, the prospect would have seemed less intolerable; but Mr. Hill stood forth as the champion of low terminal and high intermediate rates, and Mr. Morgan was the greatest speculator in the world. No one knew when Mr. Morgan might wring the Northwest dry to make a favorable report of earnings for effect on the stock-market, for it is notorious that rates have often more to do with rapid turns in New York than with the condition of the country.

"Upon a recent inquiry into a general advance in rates to the Southwest the traffic-manager of an important system testified that he made the advance for the reason that the financial manager of his company in New York instructed him to do so. Here was no delicate adjustment of rates to conditions, but simply the imposition by the controlling authority . . . of a higher . . . tax upon its patrons; and this . . . by the fiat of its New York office."*

Approached thus, the issue is clear. Upon consultation with

* Interstate Com. Com., Rep., 1903, page 15.

his Attorney-General, Mr. Roosevelt probably perceived that, were he, as President, to countenance the merger, he would become a consenting party to the farming out, over nearly one-quarter of the Union, of an unlimited transportation tax, and this to irresponsible persons. Also, Mr. Roosevelt could hardly have failed to know that, if history teaches any lesson, it is the danger of farming out taxes to those whose interest lies in making them profitable. A long line of melancholy precedents, which extend from a period far antecedent to the trial of Verres, through the Middle Ages and the French Revolution, down to the present time, seems to indicate that irresponsible taxation can hardly be permanent, and that forcing competition to its logical end may have its perils. Suppose competition to go on until, by the destruction of the weak, all the highways of the nation fall under a single ownership, as those of the Northwest have already fallen. Almost certainly, that mass of capital would be assailed. To protect itself, it is conceivable that it might assume the government. This would be an empire, but, at least, it would be a conservative and responsible empire. Or, it is equally conceivable that total or partial confiscation of railway property might follow some convulsion, as Church property has been confiscated in Europe. This would be a movement toward socialism. Neither eventuality would commend itself to a sober American statesman. Meanwhile, a middle course is open. All railway men are not despotic, and many capitalists are sagacious. The Pennsylvania Railroad, for instance, has been liberal in its policy. The Pennsylvania has understood that it is not so much the amount of the tax levied as the equality of its incidence which makes a country prosperous and contented. The citizen can often afford to pay high, if no one, by preferences, can undersell him; but to be undersold is always ruin. Accordingly, the Pennsylvania has been willing to defer profits in order to build up its intermediate territory. It has not immolated the farmer, the small town, and the struggling industry for the sake of a quick return. It has observed the long and short haul clause, though the courts have declined to enforce it; and the community has reaped the benefit. The best commentary on the wisdom of this company is the high fortune of the State which it has served. If the Pennsylvania's policy could be extended throughout the Union by law, a condition of permanent equilibrium might be attained. Had the Supreme Court sustained

the merger, the prospect of such a settlement would have vanished, for the victors would have had nothing more to gain. Their sole preoccupation would have been to prevent legislative interference. Defeated, they may incline to compromise, since to legalize merger is important to them. Conversely, merger properly regulated is an advantage to the public, if for no other reason because by suppressing competition at junctions it makes easier a general equalization of rates. If, therefore, it could be agreed that with legalized merger should go an effective board for the equalization of the transportation tax, Congress might have little hesitation in taking the carriers out of the Sherman Act.

Doubtless, after the failure of the Interstate Commerce legislation any attempt at adjustment must be matter of anxiety, since no one can foresee what a statute will ultimately mean, and no one can foretell the disposition of the judiciary. Nevertheless, the difficulties might be lessened if, at the outset, the objects to be attained were defined. In the first place, nothing would be gained by the creation of a Government Bureau to meddle with the railway business. Officials could never successfully prescribe rates; the work is too vast and too complex. It is a fallacy to imagine that good can be done by correcting single items in a schedule. The schedule works as a whole, and the grievance is either that, as a whole, it is unjust, or that it is not observed, and secret preferences are given. If a man complain of the rate on steel, and the rate on steel be reduced by government command, it benefits no one if the road may raise its rate on lumber and food to compensate itself for the loss.

What a tribunal may judiciously do is to exercise a negative. On Calloway's complaint, for example, a judge might examine the La Grange schedules and, if he found them unreasonable, order the road, under a penalty, to bring in a corrected schedule. This it probably would arrange, out of court, with the plaintiff. If the traffic-manager found the plaintiff too stiff, he would have the choice of presenting his own revision for approval, or of appealing. In any event, on failure to agree between the parties, the court might fix a provisional basis on which to do business pending the final disposition of the litigation. No one practically conversant with these controversies will pretend that complete equalization is attainable. A thousand causes are at work to vary the expense of transportation in different localities. Still these

variations may be minimized, and absolute injustice eliminated. The weak need not be destroyed because their destruction may profit the strong. For example, Chattanooga need not be made to pay an excessive tax because the Louisville & Nashville is speculating in Nashville. On considering rates in relation to the return on capital, a stock dividend of 100 per cent. might be seriously weighed as relevant evidence. A telegraphic order suddenly raising rates without regard to local conditions might be scrutinized, and, if found to be connected with stock-manipulation, it might be dealt with otherwise than by a report to Congress a year afterward. The mere existence of such a tribunal, if permitted to perform its functions, would tend to alter the attitude of the people to the carriers, since citizens would feel that they were no longer subject to a servitude, but enjoyed an approach to the privilege of contract protected by the law.

To succeed, however, such a tribunal must have the support of the legal profession, it must be able to inspire respect, and it must possess local knowledge. Perhaps no better expedient could be devised than to appoint an additional circuit judge in each judicial circuit to take cognizance of these causes. Each magistrate might preside in his own circuit, and an appeal might lie to a full bench of railway judges, sitting occasionally. All this is matter of detail. The essential is the principle of arbitration between the public and the roads, and this must be the most important issue in the approaching election. The tariff cannot be changed without the consent of a Republican Senate. The nation's Asiatic policy must await future events, no matter which party wins; but the uncontrolled farming out of the transportation tax will be dealt with by the judiciary now. It is noteworthy that of the four judges who, in the Merger litigation, declared for railway absolutism, only one is a Republican. Mr. Roosevelt stands for the principle of legal supervision for the protection of the citizen; but, if he is defeated, the Supreme Court will be reorganized by him who has the appointing power during the next four years. A change of but one vote in that tribunal now would, apparently, suffice to endow consolidating capital with a power over taxation as despotic and as arbitrary as even those who have been most extreme have demanded. It would be superfluous to add that no issue can touch every citizen more nearly.

BROOKS ADAMS.

OUR NATIONAL SUPERSTITION.

BY BARRETT WENDELL, PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

For a good many years I chanced to be a member of the Harvard Committee on Admission from other Colleges. The principal duty of this committee is to scrutinize, with what care proves possible, degrees presented as credentials by students who desire to become candidates for degrees at Harvard. I have no right to speak for any of my colleagues, past or present. That wise man who is president of Harvard College always requests us to make clear in public utterances that no Harvard man's opinion may ever pretend to more authority than happens to reside in the particular Harvard man who utters it. With this reservation, however,—that, throughout this discussion, I have neither the right nor the wish to implicate anybody else,—I have no hesitation in saying that my experience as a committee-man long ago led me to views of American education less complacent than those which now seem general. For, very clearly, there are few colleges in America from which we were not sometimes—I had almost said often—confronted with Bachelors of Arts who seemed virtually uneducated. They supposed themselves educated, all the while; and, what is more, the fact that they possessed degrees proved that numerous academic authorities officially believed these far from accomplished persons to be such as could satisfactorily pass the tests which are intended to protect the standard of education in this country. Naturally, I was driven to ask myself, now and again, what on earth that word "education" means.

The answer was not so easy as the question. The word is so familiar nowadays that we rarely stop to think how vaguely it is generally used. But, even though many of us may have framed something like definitions of it for ourselves, I doubt

whether any of us could at present venture to define it with much hope that his definition should command general assent. For the moment, accordingly, I shall not try to define it; I shall use it as vaguely as we are apt to hear it used every day of our lives. There is a fact about that use which, for our purposes, is far more important than any definition could be. Undefined and indefinite as it is, the word "education" is just now a magic one; from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it is the most potent with which you can conjure money out of public chests or private pockets. Let social troubles declare themselves anywhere—lynchings, strikes, trusts, immigration, racial controversies, whatever you chance to hold most threatening, and we are gravely assured on every side that education is the only thing which can preserve our coming generations from destruction. What is more, as a people we listen credulously to these assurances. We are told, and we believe, and we evince magnificent faith in our belief, that our national salvation must depend on education.

Whoever has travelled in both Europe and America must have plenty of visual memories to illustrate the present consequences of this national conviction of ours. Among the most dominant architectural monuments of the Old World are the great churches and religious houses everywhere erected throughout the Christian centuries by vast grants and gifts. They imply the abiding faith throughout old Europe that salvation could best be assured by unstinting generosity to the Church, which represented divine authority on earth. Sometimes, these structures were founded by corporate bodies—cities, guilds, whatever else,—who believed that special civility to divinity might win them special heavenly favor. Sometimes, they were founded by private sinners of fortune, who had been authoritatively assured that such foundations and monuments might have happy influence on the chances of their jeopardized souls. No doubt, there were noble ideals beneath it all; but these noble ideals were complicated and obscured by various less admirable states of mind and feeling. The enlightened temper of our own age and country is apt to discern these inferior motives more distinctly; and it has long been disposed to group them under the conveniently vague heading of "mediæval superstition."

In contrast to the beautiful embodiments of such superstition, which still make dreamily romantic so many of the towns and the landscapes of Europe, this surging new country of ours, proud of

its enlightenment,—I know not whether school geographies still describe Europe as "civilized" and republican America as "enlightened,"—can begin to point to dominant architectural facts of widely different character and purpose. In most of our towns and cities, particularly as you travel westward, the most stately and impressive structures are not churches or religious houses. They are rather the abiding places of schools, and colleges, and public libraries, freely devoted to the education of everybody. These structures, to be sure, lack the dreamy beauty of romantic fancy; but they are the best tokens which the munificence of our country could give that our national faith is unshaken. On education, we apparently believe, and on education alone, our national salvation depends. Sometimes, our temples of education have been founded by public bodies, from Congress itself to town meetings, who still seem unwaveringly confident that, however lax they may be about other things, faithful devotion to the interests of education will go far to atone for their errors. Sometimes, these sanctuaries of our national cult have been founded by private benefactors, whose motives occasionally seem analogous to those which prompted the pious munificences of mediæval sinners. For, ask any American what we shall do to be saved, and, if he speak his mind, he will probably bid us educate our fellow men.

In all this, when one stops to consider, there is a somewhat disturbing likeness to the superstition which nourished the now fading splendors of religious foundations throughout mediæval Europe. The men who laid these foundations never knew precisely how they were going to work. Assured, however, that religious foundations would at once work wonders and reflect inestimable credit on founders, they gave and gave, until the Church waxed fatter than the laity. Wherefore, at last, as Protestant tradition has kept busily in mind, the great good which ensued from endowments of the Church began to glow very feebly before lay eyes in general. The educational enthusiasm which now possesses our free and enlightened country does not present so marked a contrast to all this as might have been comfortably expected. When we begin to inquire, we are apt to discover that Americans in general do not know exactly what education is; and, furthermore, that they have extremely nebulous ideas of what it can accomplish. They are content with the assurance that in education lies salvation. They believe so. They give and give, ac-

cordingly, with what looks very like blind faith that they may thus justify those phases of themselves which most need justification. So far, no doubt, our institutions of learning have not waxed fat enough to excite much lay envy; yet, even already, American education is beginning to show symptoms like some among those which aroused lay hostility to the mediæval Church. Our comic papers, for example, have long found highly available any trite jests about the follies and the uselessness of college boys, and sometimes even of college girls; and I do not see how any one can doubt that American society will soon be obviously encumbered with certain vast, if respectable, mendicant orders of scholars—such as the male and the female Doctors of Philosophy.

The conclusion to which this line of thought obviously leads is disturbing. It has so often been my temperamental misfortune to express myself in a manner which has appeared frivolous that I may, perhaps, be pardoned for explicitly setting down what this conclusion at first meant to me. I have never in my life been more deeply stirred than when I finally realized what I have just been trying to explain; namely, that, in many aspects, the present mood of our country concerning education is neither more nor less than a mood of blind mediæval superstition.

My first impulse from that discovery was one of revulsion, of recoil. I felt utterly iconoclastic, like those seventeenth-century Puritans who defiled and defaced the glories of the Lady Chapel at Ely; or like Emerson, proclaiming with all his serene insolence to what still held itself his Christian congregation that, for lack of personal interest in such ceremony, he would no longer comfort the faithful with the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. It was the memory of such honest iconoclasms as these which checked my iconoclastic impulse. Christianity is none the less a spiritual force because, now and again, its spirit has become enshrouded in a mist of symbols too thick for ordinary human sight to penetrate. Nor are these symbols themselves to be disdained for the mere reason that many honest people can discern in them nothing better than idols. The fact that truth is sometimes dimmed by superstition no more means that truth is nowhere than the evanescent fogs of my own New Hampshire seaboard mean that there is no sun. Rather, indeed, we should remember that there is need of our vital sun to raise them.

Thus I began to ask myself what living truth underlay that

educational faith of ours, which on the surface seemed so densely superstitious. And here I could find little help in listening to the apostles of the hour. I was trained, you see,—so far as I was trained at all,—when Harvard was still something like an orthodox school of old-fashioned learning. That training made me, so far as it made me anything, not a technical scholar, and still less a man of science, but only a man of letters. Had I been a scholar, in the modern acceptation of the term, or a man of science, I might, perhaps, have discerned in the vagaries of educational literature something else than a mere man of letters can find there. It is possible, conceivably it is more than possible, that modern pedagogics may be struggling out of darkness into some more divine light than has been vouchsafed us yet. It is equally possible that mere men of letters may be only stray survivals of a past epoch, soon to be extinct. But, all the while, it is not possible to deny that, so far, the utterances of our pedagogic contemporaries present themselves, to such of us as survive, as things more archaic, more primally elementary, than our own. The writings of many authorities on education seem to us like the fanatical utterances of over-confident political reformers, vaunting untested panaceas. The writings of others seem like the alchemic gropings of those old pretenders to science who never got beyond explosive experiments in search of the Philosopher's Stone. At best, the confusion of tongues bespeaks an intellectual Babel.

As a man of letters, bewildered by such environment, I was consequently impelled to seek for myself what truth this bewilderment might conceal. Or, better, I was wholesomely forced to give myself the clearest account I could, of how the truth which firmly warrants our national faith in education could be perceived by eyes like mine. One thing was soon evident; there are solid historical facts on which that national faith, however superstitious its vagaries, may justly and firmly be based.

Take a single example. From our national beginnings, the history of our country has involved an experiment in democracy greater in scale and in scope than any previously attempted. One difference between this and elder systems of polity is that the elder gave factitious importance to certain distinctions of rank, which we discarded, once for all. Manifestly, these distinctions and the motives which they excited had not always proved able to place deserving men in positions of public control. One of our fervent

national hopes was that unprecedented freedom of suffrage might tend to develop leaders who should really be worthy and able. Now, a familiar fact, obvious to anybody, is that, throughout the country, our first century of national experiment gave preponderant prominence and power to the profession of the law. An equally obvious fact is that, among American professions and occupations during the nineteenth century, that of the law was most apt to contain men who had availed themselves of every educational opportunity within their reach. It is hardly excessive to say that throughout the nineteenth century the American bar proved itself a true intellectual aristocracy. In free competition, it forced itself to the fore; it asserted and justified its recognized leadership. And the secret of its superiority seemed to lie partly, even greatly, in the fact that everywhere, among other men otherwise his equals, an American lawyer had generally had the advantage of more thorough education. This is only one conspicuous example of a clear fact; quite apart from what some people call higher considerations, the practical experience of our American republic has tended to show, in a thousand ways, that education is practically worth while—that, throughout America, educated men have a palpable advantage in any struggle for political or social existence.

Yet, when one came to examine the actual education which these successful persons had enjoyed, it seemed monstrously unreasonable. It was based on the traditions of the Renaissance in Europe; and these traditions assumed that whoever was ever to know anything must begin by devoting laborious years, which he should never see again, to the acquisition of a little Latin, and less Greek, and less mathematics still. After which, and only after which, he might devote himself to so much technical study of his chosen subject or profession as circumstances should permit. The system certainly worked; to prove that, you have only to open those catalogues of New England Colleges which record the names of men who took the Bachelor's degree between 1800 and 1850. But, plainly stated, the system looked even more repugnant to plain common sense than it was efficacious.

What is more, these finished products of our traditional education were not usually expert in the matters which they had pretended to study. Even if they had been able to read the classical languages easily and to apply algebraic processes to the question

of how to make both ends meet, there might well have remained in the mind of any critical enquirer a question as to whether the energy involved in such acquisitions might not have been better directed. But, after years of work in classics, most college graduates—at least among such as ever came to my knowledge—were unable to make anything out of a Greek page or a Latin which they had not studied up for purposes of examination; and in mathematics, their real attainment, as a rule, demonstrably stopped short at long division. The thing certainly seemed preposterous, not only to people who had lacked the benefits of this higher education which the public was called on to pay for more and more, but also to people who had experienced the disheartening dulness of it. Education, everybody agreed, was a good thing; yet to almost everybody its condition seemed unintelligent and unreasonable.

Obviously, this state of affairs needed reform. Obviously, a process which, even in an unreasonable state, was so generally efficient, might be expected to work miracles if once duly rationalized. For example, if some years of reluctant struggle with Latin grammar could be replaced by an equal amount of intelligent study of one's own language, it would seem to follow that the English language would presently be handled by graduates of American schools and colleges in a manner evidently superior to any previously known or imagined. Or, if unintelligent recitation of geometrical propositions could give place to field study of the rocks and the wild-flowers of one's own neighborhood, the children of the future would not only become alert observers of natural phenomena, but incidentally they would find their school hours—hours which had been so dreary in our time—changed to hours which should glow heavenly, irradiating a finally beautiful and intelligible earth. Above all, if there were any point concerning which the temper of educational reformers tended to agree, it was this: if pupils in the past had gained so much from unintelligent study of matters which did not interest them, and which, in any event, were of no practical use, there could be no question that pupils in the future must gain incalculably more from intelligent study of matters inherently interesting and obviously useful.

The whole new system of education, from a child's first school to a man's last degree, is based on this principle, which we may call the principle of the kindergarten—not literally, of course,

but in general temper. You must try to find out just what everybody likes best, and then help him to do it as kindly as you can. You must interfere with him as little as may be—only when his impulses take a form which threatens to damage somebody else. Incidentally, if you can induce him, from early childhood, to take pleasure in handiwork,—in making something ornamental or useful,—so much the better. And, particularly, whatever he is about, he should be incited to diligence not by the selfish spur of competition, or by the degrading fear of a spanking, but by the stimulus of delight in work, or, better still, by the encouragement of altruistic enthusiasm, such as sometimes gladdens the birthday breakfast-table of papa with a rather oily paper-cutter, sandpapered by the diligent hands of baby.

There can be little question that the new education in all its stages, has turned out far more paper-cutters and the like than the old ever pretended to. In which parable we may include, once for all, its achievements in the way of technical and special training. The paper-cutters in question certainly serve a pleasant domestic purpose, and they do no harm; they are not of such quality as seriously to affect the mercantile prospects of those who deal in the real article. Under the older system, on the other hand, hardly anybody could make paper-cutters at all. But, granting this, there does arise a question as to whether this making of paper-cutters, in an atmosphere suffused with sentimental kindness, is proving itself, on the whole, a more efficient educational process than the less reasonable one which its sweet reasonableness is now tending to uproot and to supplant.

Such a question, I suppose, each of us must answer for himself. The pedagogues—and their noble army is at present innumerable—hold that, if the new system is not yet always and obviously superior in its results, it ought to be, and therefore that in due time it will be. The whole thing looks impressive in their habitual reading—namely, in educational reports. Wherever educational facts do not come within the range of one's own experience, indeed, it is hard to resist the assumption that this new education is rapidly approaching excellence. All the assumption in the world, however, cannot belie experience; and I am much deceived if the experience I have met with at Harvard, during the past twenty years, is widely different from that which must come to teachers at any American college.

In the first place, the new methods and the new subjects have not produced a higher standard of attainment. English, for example, is directly taught at schools a great deal more than it used to be, and taught, furthermore, in what are believed to be freshly vital ways. But, so far as I can see, the boys who come to college nowadays know their English just about as well as the boys of my time knew their Latin,—certainly no better. In brief, human nature remains human as ever; and, no matter what they study, or how, human children will rarely learn a bit more than they can help. Teachers of pedagogics have much to say about delight in work. For my part, I begin to think that I was right in childhood, when I held such delight to be *prima facie* evidence that a boy needed medicine.

Again, and what is far more serious, year by year, it seems to me, as the newer educational notions have supplanted the elder at schools which fit boys for college, those boys prove, when they get to college, flabbier and flabbier in mind. I remember a talk with a Harvard sophomore a few years ago which will illustrate what I mean. He was a pleasantly disposed boy, as Harvard sophomores are apt to be; and, finding himself unexpectedly aware that his mind lacked cultivation, he did me the honor to inquire how I thought he might best proceed to cultivate it. I answered that his first business should be to take in hand some hard and solid subject, and therewith to plough out the traces of the kindergarten. The look of wonder in his big brown eyes lingers with me still. How on earth did I know, he asked, that he had been to a kindergarten at all? I doubt whether I quite succeeded in explaining myself. I had recognized the fact from his inability to keep his attention fixed, for any perceptible length of time, on anything which did not happen to excite his interest; and my explanation appeared not to do so. His culture, I regret to say, seemed little improved when I met him last, about to proceed to our own degree of Bachelor of Arts. The new education had him fairly in its clutches, and the buffets of life had not yet begun to loosen them.

Again still, the actual methods of the new education are sometimes startling: a few months ago, for example, I discovered in the Freshman Class at Harvard a student, of fairly robust mental quality, who found great trouble in alphabetically sorting some hundred or two manuscripts, endorsed with the names of the

writers. A few questions revealed the cause of his perplexity. He had been taught at school to read and to write and to cipher fluently; but he had never been called upon to learn the alphabet. The order of the letters therein had impressed his school-teachers as arbitrary, and therefore not reasonable; and, desiring to be purely reasonable, these teachers had presented the twenty-six letters to him as independent phonetic symbols, of which the meaning was to be inferred from experience of them as they appeared in various words. He could spell, I subsequently discovered, rather better than I should have expected. But what use he could make of a dictionary, the Lord alone knows. After all, I suppose, the order of words in dictionaries may perhaps be held, by reasonable pedagogues, unreasonably and obsoletely arbitrary.

It was not so in our time. There can hardly be alive to-day an educated man of fifty who will not shudder when he remembers how many benumbing youthful hours he had to pass over the abhorrent pages of Andrews, or of Liddell and Scott,—more repellent, if possible, than those other horrors, the Latin and the Greek Grammars, which the methods of the older time interposed between the vital meaning of classical literature and any faithful schoolboy. No one ever recoiled from that drudgery more rebelliously than I; few, I think, can have condemned it much more freely. Through many years, extending far into my life as a college teacher, I did not cease to resent the fact that, after ten honest years of work with Latin, and six or eight with Greek, I put those studies despairingly aside, unable to read a page in either language. The same was generally true of my friends and classmates. We had been victims, it seemed, for years of an educational superstition far more blind than any which has succeeded it. Yet now that the results of what pretend to be more enlightened methods are slowly defining themselves, I begin to wonder whether, evil as our fate was, the fate of those who have followed us be not, in a chaotic way of its own, more evil still. We were ill educated, no doubt; but, from my point of view as a college teacher, the younger generations often seem hardly educated at all.

And here I find myself using the term "education" with a meaning more nearly precise than before. Education is a matter partly of information and partly of training. The latter phase of it seems to me the more important. A satisfactorily educated man distinguishes himself from an uneducated one chiefly because,

for general purposes, his faculties are better under his control. An educated man, in short, when confronted with new or unexpected problems can generally use his wits better than an uneducated one. Here we are on purely practical ground. The simple question becomes one of plain fact, not of prejudice. What kind of education makes people most frequently efficient for general purposes? Honestly answering this, though I am myself professor of a radical and practical subject, I am bound to say that purely practical considerations go far to justify the old system of classics and mathematics, in comparison with anything newer.

Though I cannot be sure that anybody else would agree with me throughout, I have some warrant for this opinion in my memory of a recurrent discussion in the Harvard faculty. At various times, the requirements for admission to Harvard College have been altered, in the interest of educational reform. On each of these occasions, our more radical colleagues have desired that our department of English should propose, as a subject for admission, what they called Advanced English,—that is, a plan for the study of English in schools which should fairly be equivalent to advanced study of the classics or of mathematics, and which might consequently be held a complete alternative. On each of these occasions, our department of English have unanimously declined to propose any such thing. And our ground, as I have understood it, has been that we could not conceive how any plan for the study of English in schools could be anything like an educational equivalent for the advanced studies which our radical colleagues desired Advanced English to supplant. In other words, we have unanimously believed that a man who is going seriously to study English at college may best prepare himself for such study by a severe preliminary training in the studies which have regularly preceded English throughout the past.

We have been reproached, accordingly, as not believing in our own subject; we have been told that we were blinded by outworn superstition. Is there any mystic power, we have been asked, in the fetiches of the schools? Can unmeaning words, just because they chance to be in Greek or in Latin, work miracles? Are we so mediæval as to bow in awe before a scholastic Abracadabra? Questions like that are really staggering. What is more, our classical and mathematical colleagues have helped us very little toward the finding of an answer to them. They repeat orthodox

formulas about the "humanities;" and the formulas of orthodoxy, infinitely edifying to the faithful, give small comfort to sceptics. Yet the fact remains, that no orthodoxy can remain vital through the centuries unless its formulas enfold some truth which must give us pause. And what the truth is which made the elder training so much more efficient than the new is beginning, at least for me, to shine clear.

The practical aim of a general education, I have said, is such training as shall enable a man to devote his faculties intently to matters which of themselves do not interest him. The power which enables a man to do so is obviously the power of voluntary, as distinguished from spontaneous, attention. Any one, for example, can read the items in a newspaper. With no more interruption than occasional skipping, any one can read a novel which interests him. Any one can keep his wits fixed on a well written play, particularly if the performers possess the advantage of personal attraction. But the moment anything be long or dull—sermon, poem, or problem, it is all one—only those can keep their wits from wandering who have somehow learned to control them. In other words, whatever interests people commands their spontaneous attention, and accordingly such power of concentration as is naturally theirs. But if a man is to make anything whatever out of a matter which does not interest him, he must concentrate his powers on it by a strenuous act of voluntary attention.

It is precisely this faculty of voluntary attention which education, in the broadest sense, can most surely cultivate. The fact that it can do so is patent, when you consider what education has actually done. The faculty of voluntary attention, for example, obviously distinguished the American lawyers of the nineteenth century from their fellow citizens, of whom they were so apt to take the lead. That faculty clearly distinguished the college students of thirty years ago from the flabbier students of to-day. And that faculty, I believe, such persons as these, whom we may hastily take as typical, gained largely from that elder system of education to which they were forced to submit. And no one, I believe, can gain it in anything like the same degree from methods as yet devised by apostles of the kindergarten. The elder education, to be sure, cultivated voluntary attention, not because it specifically insisted that pupils should unintelligently devote tedious years to grammars and dictionaries of Latin and

Greek, or to lifeless variants of the extinct vitality of Euclid. But, unknowingly, it cultivated the faculty well. Through daily hours, throughout all their youthful years, it compelled boys, in spite of every human reluctance, to fix their attention on matters which, of themselves, could never have held attention for five minutes together.

No doubt, plenty of subjects other than classics or mathematics could have been made to serve this purpose and could be made to now. You can hardly imagine a subject, essentially uninteresting, which would not reward plodding work with a similar result—with substantial ignorance of the matter studied, but with increasingly and lastingly muscular power of voluntary attention. The only actual practical virtue which lies in the traditional subjects comes mostly from the accident that they are traditional. As a natural consequence, they have acquired, through the centuries, a degree of precision not yet attained by any rivals. Even unsympathetic and unintelligent teachers can, therefore, keep closer watch of them. If the attention of boys who study classics or mathematics begins to wander, it can instantly be perceived as vagrant. If it errs, its errors can swiftly and certainly be corrected. And the very fact that the classical languages are dead, and that the abstractions of mathematics must generally seem repellently lifeless, is part of the secret of their educational vitality. Of late years, it has often been supposed that training in natural science would do more for the power of voluntary attention, and therefore would have a higher educational value, than training in the old humanities. So far as my observation has gone, this has not yet proved the case. And one reason why it has not, I am disposed to think, is because the natural sciences are apt nowadays to prove a shade too interesting. In the end, accordingly, like other alluring things, they often excite an attention more nearly spontaneous than voluntary. If so, the study of them would inevitably result rather in technical information and habitual aptitude of a special kind, than in any broad general training, available for any other service than that immediately concerned.

The classics and mathematics have, doubtless, been tyrannical, and, what is worse, they have been supercilious. There can be little doubt that the day of their dominance is past; and that resentment of their pretensions will long blind the educational au-

thorities of our democratic country and age to the real nature of their educational potence. Of all educational superstitions, we may freely admit, none is more instantly apparent than that which worships the classics and mathematics as idols. And yet the newer educational superstition, which bows the knee to pedagogics, is beginning to seem more mischievously idolatrous still. For behind the dethroned idols there was an orthodox truth, not yet discernible behind the new; and the education which resulted from the elder system had a virtue which must somehow be revived, if the new is to justify the magnificent and generous faith of our still youthful America. No education, I believe, can serve much practical purpose, in training men for the perplexing diversities of practical life, unless it base itself on the training, throughout the flexible years, of that faculty of voluntary attention which only in maturity should be suffered to range among the matters of its choice or of its incidental duty. Any education, on the other hand, which does this work is a priceless boon, not only to those who have won it, but to the country of which they are citizens.*

BARRETT WENDELL.

* This article substantially reproduces a Commencement address, delivered at Haverford College, on June 10, 1904.

A SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT.

BY CHARLES W. THOMAS.

THE unabridged and exclusive right to fix the qualifications of voters was reserved to and exercised by the several States of the Union until the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution. That right still exists, subject only to the prohibition expressed in that Amendment. The removal of that prohibition would leave the several States vested with the exclusive power to regulate the suffrage, for all purposes, within their respective jurisdictions. The provision of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment, to the effect that no State shall abridge the privileges or immunities of any citizen of the United States, has no reference to the right to vote, because the right to vote in any State is not now and never was a privilege or immunity guaranteed to any person by reason of such citizenship.

The fundamental theory of our Government is that the United States and the several States shall each be and remain supreme in their respective spheres of governmental action. All powers not expressly, or by reasonable intendment, granted by the Constitution to the United States were reserved to the States and the people. The Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery, was the first abridgement of the power of the States to establish the *status* of their own citizens, and to control their own affairs. The second limitation upon that power was section 4 of the Fourteenth Amendment, which forbids the United States or any State to assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion, or for the loss or emancipation of any slave. These two limitations upon the power of the States to act with reference to their own affairs, have received the approval of all the people of the United States, and no enlightened citizen would, at this time, have them, or either of them, abrogated. These two

are the only abridgements expressly made by the Constitution of the otherwise unabridged powers of the States to act without restraint, in all matters pertaining to their own local governments. Neither of them increases in any degree the powers of the Federal Government. They have no centralizing effect. They forbid the States to do certain things, but they do not give the United States any power to do the same things. The Federal and State Governments are alike subject to their prohibitions. Taken together, they meet the demands of the enlightened conscience of civilization and have the approval of all good citizens.

The scheme of reconstruction adopted after the Civil War, and necessarily influenced to some extent by the exasperated condition of the public mind at that time, included the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery, and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. When we consider the immense sums of money spent by the United States; the vast debt incurred; the lives lost; the homes made desolate; the futures of a host of good men ruined by mutilation and disease, and all the uncatalogued evils suffered by the people in the maintenance of the law in the Civil War, which was deemed to have been occasioned by a useless revolt against an authority which did not oppress, we must stand amazed at the moderation of the conquerors. But, as praiseworthy as that moderation now seems to be, it involved a radical change in the relation of the General Government to the States, which was, unfortunately, unwise in its theory as well as imperfect in its expression.

Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment and the Fifteenth Amendment are the only provisions pertinent to this discussion, and, for convenience of reference, they are here reproduced:

"XIV., §2.—Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, *the executive and judicial officers of a State or the members of the Legislature thereof*, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

"XV., §1.—The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude."

The Fifteenth Amendment is virtually a dead letter. It was so formulated that it could be legally annulled and abrogated by every State which was willing to enact the legislation necessary to avoid its effect. It has been so annulled and abrogated, and has proved wholly inefficacious for the main purpose for which it was adopted. It is a demonstrated failure and no longer has any usefulness, except as evidence of the incapacity of its authors to do what they intended to do. It stands now virtually repealed by the ingenuity of those whom it was intended to restrain. It is a monument to the inability of statesmen who discovered a way how to do a thing which turned out to be a way how not to do it. It encumbers the Constitution.

Up to this date, both of the constitutional provisions above quoted are as though they had never been enacted. No serious attempt has been made to enforce the penalty prescribed by section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the States which have annulled the Fifteenth Amendment, in their several jurisdictions, still have representation in the Electoral College and in Congress, virtually based upon vast numbers of disfranchised voters, who were not disfranchised for participation in rebellion or other crime. No reasonable man can expect that the States which, on account of these conditions, are deprived of their just representation in the Electoral College and in Congress, will long suffer that deprivation; and the question what remedy shall be chosen to cure this evil, will soon become one which will demand and receive a just and equitable settlement. The people will not permit the fundamental law of the land to be forever disobeyed and held for naught. But no fair man can fail to see the difficult political problem which these constitutional provisions presented to the people of the Southern States. Their chief complaint has been that the Fifteenth Amendment, if honestly enforced or acquiesced in, takes from the intelligent and property-owning class of people in that section the direction of their local affairs, and gives it entirely, or in a great measure, to an ignorant constituency, wholly incompetent to manage the affairs of any government whatever. The evils they complain of are not fancied, but actual and disastrous. They are such as could not be endured, and State after

State, when the people had become weary of the odium which attached itself to open force and covert fraud, provided legal devices, more or less ingenious, to avoid the effects of the Fifteenth Amendment. They chose rather to risk the penalties prescribed by section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, than to surrender the control of their local affairs to the management of an ignorant and incompetent constituency. Whether they were governed by any proper code of political ethics or not, is a question which need not be discussed. They were certainly impelled by considerations of self-preservation; and, while they may be blamed by rigid political moralists, the sound common sense of the people will not fail to recognize the threatening emergency under which they acted.

Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment is open to just criticism, both as to matter of substance and matter of form. Both this section and the Fifteenth Amendment, taken together as part of one plan, are the converse of what they ought to have been. They are based upon the denial or abridgement of the right to vote, when they ought to have been based upon the granting and extension of that right. They tacitly assume that all male citizens of the United States are entitled to vote at all elections, and they provide a penalty for any abridgement of that right; when they ought to have assumed that the right to vote was one which might, or might not, be given to such citizens by the States respectively, and by each State to the extent that it saw fit to prescribe, and the penalty ought to have been made to depend upon the extent to which the several States exercised their power to limit the suffrage of those citizens in national elections, with which alone the National Government has any just concern. The scheme ought to have contemplated an inducement to extend the suffrage, instead of providing a penalty for abridging or denying it.

But, defective as the plan is in the respect mentioned, it is also a radical departure from the established scheme of our government. The provision of section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment providing a penalty for abridging or denying the right to vote for the executive and judicial officers of a State or members of the Legislature thereof, is an unwise, punitive provision, enacted, not for any good purpose affecting the whole people of the United States, but for the sole purpose of punishing the people of certain

States for refusing to surrender their local governments to virtual anarchy. It is an unjust interference by the United States with matters which in no wise concern its government. It is a reversal of the well-established relation which theretofore existed between the Federal and State Governments, and an unjustifiable departure from ancient methods. To enforce it will re-open wounds that are well-nigh healed, and entail again the bitterness of sectional strife.

Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment is not and cannot be uniform in its operation, and is therefore unjust. It links together two bases of representation. The primary basis of representation is the number of inhabitants, but the penalty for denying or abridging the right to vote is based upon the proportion which the number of the disfranchised bears, not to the number of the inhabitants, but to the number of male citizens twenty-one years of age. Inasmuch as the number of citizens of the United States of the age of twenty-one years in any one State does not bear the mathematical relation to the number of its inhabitants that the number of such citizens in any other State bears to the inhabitants of that State, it is apparent that this section cannot have a uniform operation. Illustrations could be given but they are unnecessary at this time. They can be supplied by any one curious and industrious enough to consult the report of the Census.

There is another objection to section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment which goes to the practicability of its enforcement. Suppose that a State denies to any citizen of the United States the right to vote, because he failed to pay a poll-tax. The number of such persons would not in any two years bear the same proportion to those who paid the tax, and what just rule could be devised under which the penalty imposed by this section could be enforced? Any law of Congress enforcing that penalty must necessarily be specific and self-acting. It could not leave the extent of the penalty to be fixed by any executive or judicial officer, to be changed as the conditions changed. Every ten years Congress would be called upon, in the discharge of its legislative duty, to fix the representation of the several States in Congress and in the Electoral College for the succeeding ten years. What prior year would it take as a criterion, when it came to consider the abridgement or denial of the right to vote based upon non-payment of a

poll-tax? Other denials of that right for other reasons might be referred to as illustrating the fundamental mistake first above referred to, namely, the failure to hold out an inducement to grant the suffrage, instead of prescribing a penalty for denying or abridging it, but this one is sufficient at this time. The difficulties in the way of enforcing section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment may not be insurmountable; but, apart from the sectional bitterness that would be aroused by any attempt to do so, those difficulties would tax severely the ingenuity of our lawmakers.

The remedy for this unfortunate condition of the fundamental law seems to be to do now what might have been done in the first place, and probably would have been done, if calm consideration had dispelled the idea that it was a case of imposing penalties upon wrong-doers. If some such remedy is not found, the provisions of section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, rigorous as they are, must be enforced. Such a remedy can be found. Adopt a Sixteenth Amendment which might be substantially as follows:

"XVI., §1.—The Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and sections 2 and 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment thereto are hereby repealed and abrogated.

"§2.—Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to the number of male inhabitants of the age of twenty-one years and over, being citizens of the United States, who are permitted by law in the States respectively to vote for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States and for Representatives in Congress.

"§3.—Congress shall have power, by laws uniform in their operation, to fix the time and prescribe the manner of holding elections for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States and Representatives in Congress, and the power to enforce all the provisions of this article by any appropriate legislation."

Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment is included in the above suggestion because it refers solely to the imposed disabilities of those who were in rebellion, and is no longer of any force except as an unpleasant reminder of internecine war.

The above proposed amendment places the power to regulate the suffrage where it was before the Fifteenth Amendment was adopted. It permits the States, as far as their local elections are concerned, to abridge or deny the right to vote thereat as they see fit, and visits them with no penalty whatever for so doing. It simply provides that their representation in the Electoral College

and in Congress shall be as they severally choose to make it by affirmative legislation. If any State desires a maximum national representation it will, by law, permit all male citizens of the United States twenty-one years of age and over to vote for electors and Representatives, as is now the case under the Constitutions of a large majority of the States of the Union. If any State concludes that the evils of an extended suffrage in that regard more than counterbalance the benefits to be derived from a full national representation, it can so provide. The Federal Government will have removed its hand from any control of local elections in the States, and returned to the States the power to prescribe the qualifications of voters at all elections, retaining only the power to fix the time and prescribe the manner of holding such elections as affect its own administration. It will have substituted persuasion for penalties, simplicity for complexity, certainty for uncertainty and uniformity for confusion. The impending struggle for the enforcement of the penalties named in section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment would be happily averted, and all its attendant evils avoided. A free choice to be made by the complaining States would be substituted for a penalty imposed upon them for assuming and retaining control of their own local governments, and saving these from ruin and anarchy.

Some such measure ought to receive the ready and earnest approval of all fair-minded men in the South. We have had enough of strife and sectional bitterness. The people who are now deprived of their just representation in the Electoral College and in Congress would deeply regret the necessity of a sectional struggle to get their rights; but, unless some other remedy is found, they will be forced to apply the one they now have. The Southern States have an influence in national affairs to which they are not rightfully entitled. They have had such an influence since the foundation of the government, and they cannot reasonably expect the other States of the Union, who have done no wrong to the Constitution, to submit forever to an unjust and unlawful discrimination against them.

No matter what sympathy reasonable men may have for them in the unhappy conditions imposed upon them by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, the Southern States may rest assured that all that sympathy would disappear if they stubbornly refused to accept some such compromise as that above suggested, and per-

sisted in claiming in the national councils a weight which they have always had and to which they are no longer entitled. The oppression to which they have been subjected is no justification for allowing them a representation in the Electoral College and in Congress based upon vast numbers of citizens of the United States whom they will not permit to vote at national elections. The States which are deprived of their fair share of representation will certainly, sooner or later, insist upon the enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment and the imposition of the penalty therein provided for. Their people belong to a patient and long-suffering race and are slow to act; but our recent history has shown that, when they conclude that the time for action has arrived, no obstacles are sufficient to stay their progress or turn them from their purpose. This is not a matter of partisan politics or sectional prejudice. It touches the self-respect of a very large majority of the people of the United States. The present conditions offend their sense of justice. They want no more strife with their brethren. They would much prefer a remedy which would permit a gradual, orderly and regular extension of the suffrage in national elections, to the enforcement of the onerous penalties now prescribed by the Constitution. They do not wish to have the Federal Government interfering in the purely local elections of the States. They are willing to deny that power to the United States, but they are not willing to submit forever to the discrimination from which they now suffer.

The situation is grave enough to enlist the best efforts and the most enlightened judgment of our statesmen in devising some fair and just method of settling this great and serious question. It is now pressing for the considerate attention of our people, and it will continue to urge itself upon them until they settle it aright.

CHARLES W. THOMAS.

GEORGE FREDERICK WATTS.

BY ROYAL CORTISSOZ.

So far as the available records go to show, the long life of the late George Frederick Watts was unmarked by any of the incidents which make an artist's biography romantic or exciting, as his character was untinged by any of the qualities which turn a man into an object of morbid curiosity. His passing was very different from that of Whistler, for example, whose death was a signal for the outpouring of innumerable piquant recollections. There are no stories to be told about Watts. He was the hero of no war of words. In fact, there was something in his personality akin to that of Wordsworth, whose "plain living and high thinking" he made his own rule of life. Like the poet, he had a lofty mind, loved seclusion, and did his work in the world with a devotion and a dignity which can only be described as unworldly. The earliest portrait of him that I know is one painted by himself when he was still a young man. It is the portrait of a thinker. I cannot imagine him, at any period of his career, as other than a grave, fine-fibered man, dedicated by all the impulses of his nature to ennobling tasks, and absorbed, amid all the materialism and turmoil of our modern life, in

> "High and passionate thoughts,
> To their own music chanted."

"What," asks the reader to whom, perhaps, technique means more than the thing it is used to express, "What has all this to do with Watts's art?" Everything, as it seems to me. He was the one painter of his time in England to whom the *idea* was a controlling force, so saturating his art, in all its relations, that you could not approach him in any of his moods without instantly realizing that he had something to say to you, and that this some-

thing supplied the picture in question with its chief reason for existing. None of his fellow countrymen, with the possible exception of William Blake, ever conveyed quite the same impression of art surcharged with thought. Men like Leighton, Burne-Jones, Rossetti and Millais seem, beside him, the merest story-tellers. The only point that he ever had in common with them was an inability to acquire complete technical proficiency. In all other respects he occupied a place apart, exercising unique power in the creation of beautiful and significant images, every one of them stamped with the quality of his brain and appealing to us as symbols, not as painted things. His absorption in the idea rather than in the fact is indicated in the description given by one of his biographers, the Rev. Hugh Macmillan, of his method of working:

"He never uses any model to help him; nor does he arrange, as is the manner of the painters, the folds of robes, and the other lay figures and furniture of his pictures beforehand in his studio, to enable him to realize these features more vividly. He paints his pictures entirely, from first to last, from his own imagination, and introduces no copy of any outward object to mar the ideal effect. In this way, the outward representation of his conception is, as it were, of one piece with the inward imagination. . . . He makes no preparatory studies, in whole or in part, of his pictures. He first thinks out the subjects of them in all their details in his own mind: and then directly begins to sketch them out on the canvas, without the intervention of any design between him and them."

Plainly, the artist of whom this was written was as far away from the purely literary atmosphere of the English Pre-Raphaelites, as he was from the strictly technical ideals of those to whom Velasquez and Hals are the only important figures in the history of European painting. Watts stood aside, then, from the prevailing tendencies of modern art. He exhibited at the Royal Academy, of which he was a loyal supporter, but he always seemed a kind of anachronism there, an old master, born out of his time, strayed in amongst the Philistines. The spirit of his work was no more in harmony with that of Burlington House than with that of the Salon. In the old Grosvenor Gallery, and afterwards in the New Gallery, he exhibited under perhaps more congenial conditions, but his work appeared to best advantage in Little Holland House, his own home, to which he gladly admitted the pub-

lic, or in some such separate arrangement as that which was given to the collection of his portraits and pictures brought to this country and shown at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1885. He must be considered largely as an isolated phenomenon, if the true outlines of his artistic character are to be apprehended. There is nothing in his style that can be identified as due to the influence of this or that master. In his youth he had no instruction that amounted to anything, either in the drawing-school of the Royal Academy, which he attended for a time, or in the studio of the sculptor, William Behnes, which he entered as a kind of observer. The Elgin marbles are said to have made a deep impression upon him, but they did not make him a classicist. When he obtained a prize in a public competition with a decorative design, "Caractacus Led in Triumph through the Streets of Rome," and used the money to go to Italy, in the early forties, he stayed there four years without transforming himself into a neo-Italian. Yet, if we are not to make his originality too unnatural a thing, but must link him somewhere with the masters of painting, it is to the great Venetians that I should say he was, in a measure, akin.

He understood and, I believe, loved their language, their large, stately way of putting things, and their heroic but restrained passion. Form, in his eyes, as in theirs, took on a certain grandeur, was marmoreal and even hierophantic. Moreover, for him, as for them, it was of little worth, save in so far as it lent itself to the more nobly dramatic issues of the imaginative world. For the devotional ecstasy and dainty conceits, the classical balance and artless realism of the earlier Florentines he seems to have had less sympathy. His instinctive drift toward the grand style may be pointedly illustrated by an episode dating from before his departure for Italy. He painted then a large canvas, formerly in the possession of the Cosmopolitan Club but now in the Tate Gallery, representing that pitiful hunting scene which brings a fantastic horror into Boccaccio's story of Nastagio degli Onesti, in the fifth day of the Decameron. Now, a Florentine in the *bottega* of Botticelli, possibly Sandro himself, decorated one of four *cassone* panels with the same subject. The picture is in the collection of M. Spiridion at Paris. It is a beautiful example of Tuscan narrative art, naïve but spirited. The scene is realized with almost painful vividness. The naked woman, flying from the

huntsman, holds, so to say, the centre of the stage, and we are spared nothing of the brutality of the pursuing mastiffs, sinking their teeth in her white flesh. All the details of a tragically interrupted banquet, the guests springing from their chairs, the overturned table, the flying dishes and utensils, are painted with the utmost accuracy, and in the background trees, ships, tents, castles and hills are drawn with loving care. Here, in a word, is a line-for-line illustration to the story. Watts saw the subject as Titian might have seen it. He set the scene in a landscape rendered imposing by a broad view of the open sea, threw the astonished witnesses of the hunt into a group as simple in its masses of form and drapery as it is dramatic in sentiment, and made his hunted woman a type of nameless terror rather than one of physical anguish, gleaming like a phantom beneath the shadow of a foe as mysterious as the knight in the Florentine *cassone* piece is of the earth earthy. It does not matter that the latter is, in its minor way, a little masterpiece, and that the painting by Watts is, in execution, sadly wanting in signs of mastery. The spirit of the thing is what arrests the critic, disclosing to him the majestic pace adopted by Watts even at that early period.

I would like to see the fresco with which he embellished the Villa Careggi, near Florence, where Lord and Lady Holland entertained him in the course of his Italian wanderings. It commemorates the death of a physician who was accused of poisoning his master. The unhappy man was cast into a well. Could Watts have adjusted so violent and even atrocious a theme to the exacting requirements of pictorial art? For my part, I do not believe the task daunted him in the least. He must have found the way out with ease. This, not simply because of that exalted temperament of his, which made it always natural for him to invent gracious and imposing designs to carry his ideas, but because he had, for a man untrained in the schools, an extraordinary command over plastic forms and could, indeed, mould them to his purposes with an authority greater than that of many a skilled Academician. It was not in the subtleties of modelling that he excelled. On the contrary, his surfaces were apt to be coarsely handled; his contours were roughly generalized, rather than exquisitely drawn, and his flesh tints were notoriously muddy. But in the broad massing of forms he was a master; in flinging the sinewy limbs of his men into just the right attitudes, in lending

to his mighty deep-bosomed women an air like that of Michael Angelo's solemn Amazons, he was not only powerful but fluent. You feel that the man who could treat the human figure in this fashion, nude or draped, had an almost Greek delight, and skill, in solving the most difficult of all artistic problems. Only, for the joy of the Greek in the beauty of form as an end in itself, we have, in Watts, an essentially modern perturbation of soul, a constant concern for the emotions under which these sentient beings, whose bodies he delineates with so facile a hand, may be laboring as he paints them. Nay, they *must* quiver with emotion, else he cannot paint them at all. We have seen how he avoided practical study of the nude, how the Elgin marbles took the place of the living model in his experience. One feels, vaguely, in studying his work, that in his eyes the portrayal of the human form for its own sake must have seemed a kind of sacrilege. No; for him the heroes of mythology or of Scripture, the figures he drew from old or modern literature, and those in which he embodied his own reflections on life and death, were symbols or nothing. This is to be regretted in so far as it placed a drag upon his technical advancement, but it is to be valued, on the other hand, for the stimulus that it must have given to his inventive faculty. Eager to pack his art with meaning, and too original, as he was too lofty of mind, to rely on lifeless accessories for the elucidation of his idea, he made that plastic gift to which I have referred a means to a spiritual end, giving to form an eloquence all his own.

No one in England ever approached him in making a figure thrill with a specific emotion, or in giving it an attitude absolutely expressive of a predominant thought. Across the Channel, there were one or two men who moved on the same high plane; but Puvis de Chavannes, who was greatly his superior as a painter, wanted his weight of line, and was rarely as poignant in emotion as Watts was all the time; while Gustave Moreau, that turbid genius, never had half the Englishman's grasp of a subject. Robbed of their accessories, the pair in Moreau's "Medea and Jason" might stand forth as academic abstractions. With or without their accessories, there is no mistaking the actors in Watts's tragic dramas. Is it the falling lyre in his "Orpheus and Eurydice," or is it the relaxed form of the goddess, the pallor in her face, and the tense alarm visible in the whole frame of the god, that tell us the story? In one version the artist painted of

this composition, the lyre does not appear at all. What is it that proclaims the stricken lovers, floating like incarnations of dolor in the night across the most touching canvas that Watts ever painted, the Paolo and Francesca of Dante's poem? There is nothing there to trick out the theme and meet the lagging spectator half-way; you do not need to consult a catalogue in the presence of this picture—the figures in it are their own interpreters. Turn from this to some such essay in pretty romanticism as Rossetti's "Paolo and Francesca," and ask yourself what would become of the meaning of that work if the name of Malatesta were eliminated from the window and the book were taken from Paolo's knee. We would have then simply a kiss, exchanged by any lovers in any age. Concentration, simplicity, a faculty for tearing the heart out of a subject and transferring it to canvas intact, these were the salient characteristics of Watts as an imaginative designer, separating him, as by a gulf, from the great horde of modern picture-makers.

Once, in the catalogue to an exhibition of his, he said: "The great majority of these works must be regarded rather as hieroglyphs than anything else, certainly not as more than symbols, which all art was in the beginning, and which everything is that is not directly connected with physical conditions." I dare say that, with this seeming warrant, there will not be wanting expositors, by and by, to tell us all manner of things about what this man of dreams and deep thought put into his pictures. But there does not really seem to be anything very dark about his "hieroglyphs." Take almost any of his pictures, "Charity," "The Throne of Death," "Diana and Endymion," "The Bridge of Life," "Prometheus," "The Death of Abel," "Mammon," "The Minotaur," "Galahad," "Love and Death," and so on through the long list. I do not pretend that every one of them is an open book. But, taking Watts's mythological, allegorical and illustrative designs all together, there is surprisingly little mysticism in them; they are never wilfully obscure; they stand, first and last, for the effort of a noble spirit to comfort and cheer mankind with fine ideas, set forth in direct fashion. Incidentally, the artist—since he is, after all, an artist as well as a teacher—will exert the charm of beautiful form and monumental design. Incidentally, though he has not the gift of color but is, on the contrary, always at odds with his palette, and cannot help leaving his

tones stringy and impure, without any of the luminosity which one feels the gods ought to have granted him, he will do his best to throw a sensuous glamour over his canvas. But, above all, he will enforce upon you the sublimity of life and death, the magic of poetry, the thought and feeling that make art always, in the last resort, a matter of humanity as well as of paint and brushes.

If these preoccupations of his tell constantly in his pictures, they are hardly less effective in his portraits, which are so clearly works "of the centre," so rich in the qualities of the painter for whom surfaces are only veils but dimly hiding the soul beneath, that they would have given him the rank he enjoyed even if he had never painted anything else. In the "Life of Tennyson" it is recorded that "he once asked Mr. Watts to describe his ideal of what a true portrait-painter should be, and he embalmed the substance of Mr. Watts's reply in some of the noblest lines in the "Idylls." Here are the lines:

> "As when a painter, poring on a face,
> Divinely, through all hindrance, finds the man
> Behind it, and so paints him that his face,
> The shape and color of a mind and life,
> Lives for his children, ever at its best."

It must have been as far back as the fifties that the poet and the painter had their dialogue on this subject, but even earlier Watts had shown that he held the view of portraiture which Tennyson put into verse for him—and lived up to it. The portrait of himself in armor, painted for Lord Holland in his Italian period, is much more than a costume study: the character of the man looks out piercingly from the romantic canvas, and the portraits of political and other notabilities which he drew or painted then and not long after for the same patron, all denote a resolution to grasp the things to which externals are but an index. Fate was kind to him. In Lord Holland's circle he found the most interesting sitters, the Princess Mathilde, Lucien Bonaparte, the Duc d'Aumale, Guizot and Thiers, and many other figures of the great world. He had then a markedly precise method, not inflexible, but still more painstaking than free. Some of these early portraits of his recall the French Academicians of the time; they might have been painted by Flandrin or Delaroche. The savor of formalism in them is in curious contrast to the intellectual vitality they

possess. Watts was not long, however, in broadening his method, and the tendency in the great mass of portraiture by which he is chiefly known to-day, the fruit of his riper years, is all in the direction of bolder modelling and looser brushwork. He gives a profounder rendering of structure, and envelops it in a richer atmosphere. From the start he seems to have gravitated toward types of mature and brilliant manhood, rather than toward feminine charm. When he did execute portraits of women, he made them, like his portraits of men, studies of character, wasting no time or energy on the pretty effects so dear to the fashionable portrait-painter. One amongst the comparatively small number of these paintings, the famous full length of the Hon. Mrs. Percy Wyndham, is a portrait of the modern *grande dame,* which, for dignity and high-bred sentiment, might stand beside the historic canvases of the Venetian school. A more delicate tribute was never offered by a young painter to a veteran, than the one which Sargent offered to Watts, when he introduced this full length into the background of his celebrated triple portrait of Mrs. Wyndham's daughters, the canvas now popularly known as "The Three Graces." It was the happiest of salutations from a modern to an old master. But, for the fullest measure of Watts's genius as a portrait-painter we must still go to that wonderful array of canvases in which he commemorated the statesmen, poets and other public men of the Victorian era.

He was their "limner in extraordinary," the interpreter of their genius, and, so far as their personalities were concerned, the custodian of their fame. He had it in his hand to send his sitters down to posterity as so many "frail tenements of clay," or as the embodiments of certain qualities of mind or soul; and somehow, in spite of the technical limitations which always hampered him, he followed with remarkable success the course which his idealistic nature inevitably dictated to him. His scope was unbounded, for his sympathy embraced the most diverse types. He portrayed Swinburne and Rossetti as readily as Tennyson or Matthew Arnold, and was no less sure of hand when painting the lean ascetic features of Leslie Stephen than when painting the leonine head of Lord Lawrence. No doubt, it sometimes happened that his sitters did not see themselves as Watts saw them. Carlyle did not like his portrait, and it is said that Cardinal Manning was much distressed when Watts gave him an unduly florid com-

plexion. He did not realize that his red robes, from which the light was reflected on his face, were responsible for this, and blamed the painter for making him look, as he thought, like a high liver. But the general testimony of those who have known the celebrities painted by Watts, goes to confirm the impression derived by the world at large from the canvases alone—that he had a gift for telling the truth about his sitters. His portraits are in harmony with all that we know of them and of their work. By his grace they will be known in the future precisely as they were, and for precisely what they were. In thus creating permanent memorials of the great Englishmen of his time, he not only put the individual in his debt, but laid the nation under a heavy obligation, and it is perhaps worth while to ask what his countrymen did to show their gratitude.

They praised him without stint. They freely accepted the gifts he made to more than one public institution, his splendid addition to the stores of the National Portrait Gallery being received with positive enthusiasm. Twice a Baronetcy was offered to him—only to be refused on both occasions. Watts had no taste for titles. The most that he would accept from the Government was membership in the Order of Merit established on the coronation of the present King. The Academy was quick to honor itself in honoring him, and he was not without the usual official recognition, both at home and abroad, which an artist of his distinction would be bound to receive. Yet England never gave him the opportunity to paint upon the walls of her public buildings those colossal decorations in which his genius might, perhaps, have found its best outlet. The work he executed for a hall in the Houses of Parliament, early in the fifties, was not followed by similar commissions. The fresco in Lincoln's Inn he executed at his own expense, and when he offered to decorate the interior of Euston Station without charge to the railway company, the directors refused their consent. In short, private individuals were frequently forthcoming to employ his brush, but the managers of the larger enterprises which nominally, at least, stand more or less for a public policy, passed him by. Are the English to be blamed? It is always natural to scorn a nation's neglect of its great men. But to approach this point is to approach the whole question of Watts's standing as an artist, to ask whether he was one of those commanding geniuses who enforce themselves upon their age, or

one of the less fortunate men in whose characters there are hiatuses, imperfections, limitations, which act forever as bars to the achievement of unquestioned fame. There can be no doubt that Watts belonged to this latter class, and it is juster, I think, frankly to recognize that fact, than to criticise the English for leaving a talent unexploited at their gates.

Great he was, with the greatness of a fine intellect and a pure imagination; his moral fervor reacted upon his work with results that it would be silly to group with those of the ordinary painter of didactic anecdotes, and all through the tangible fabrics of his creating, in the dramatic sweep of his design, and in the nobility of his forms, you discern a beauty that has the accent of greatness upon it. But Watts was not a great *painter;* he did not reach in drawing, modelling, and color the plane of the great masters, and without that uplift he failed, necessarily, to impose himself absolutely upon his generation, to bend his countrymen to his will or to found a school.

ROYAL CORTISSOZ.

FOUR YEARS OF ANTI-TRUST ACTIVITY: A REVIEW.

BY JAMES WILFORD GARNER.

THE boast of the Republican party in its national platform, that the existing laws for the protection of the public against "vast aggregations of capital" have been "fearlessly enforced" by President Roosevelt, and that, besides, new and valuable supplementary anti-trust legislation has been enacted by Republican Congresses, and the counter-declarations of the Democratic party in its platform, make it worth while to review briefly the important Federal anti-trust legislation and judicial interpretation since the accession of President Roosevelt, with a view to ascertaining what has really been accomplished.

For the first two years of the period under review, little or nothing was done either through legislation or criminal prosecution. It was a period of discussion and recommendation, rather than of action. During the summer of 1902, President Roosevelt made a number of speeches in which he advocated government control of the great corporations which have come to be known as "trusts." As a preliminary step to this end, he urged that the government should exercise its undoubted right to inspect and examine the workings of these combinations. "Publicity," he said, "is the only sure remedy which we can now invoke." In his messages of December, 1901, and 1902, he reiterated and reemphasized this idea. "It can do no harm," he insisted, "to the honest corporation, and we need not be overtender about sparing the dishonest corporation." The President's arguments were reenforced by Attorney-General Knox, who, in his noted speech of October 14th before the Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce, expressed the opinion that corporations engaged in inter-State commerce should be subjected to "visitorial supervision," and that "full and accu-

rate information as to their operations should be made regularly at reasonable intervals." Mr. Knox also ridiculed the suggestion looking to an amendment of the Federal Constitution by his unanswerable argument that Congress already has sufficient power to deal with the trusts, without further changes in the fundamental law.

Now as to actual results. In the closing session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, a bill, fathered by Mr. Littlefield, of Maine, and embodying the ideas of the administration, was passed by the House four days before the end of the session, and practically without opposition. It was too late, however, for the Senate to take action on it, and the bill failed. The Democrats charged the Republican leaders with merely playing a game for party effect, and asserted that the passage of the bill was purposely delayed until the end of the session with an intention of preventing its enactment into law.

During the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, which met in December, 1901, a perfect deluge of anti-trust bills was introduced into both Houses. The purposes of some of these, as indicated in their titles, were: to "suppress trusts," to "regulate trusts," to "suspend duties on articles controlled by trusts," to "enlarge the act of 1890," to "require reports and returns from trusts," to "enforce the laws against trusts," to "prohibit inter-State transportation of trust-made goods," to "tax articles manufactured by trusts," to "apply the bankruptcy laws to trust evils," to "create an anti-trust commission," etc., etc. None of these bills, however, ever reached an advanced position on the calendar and the session ended, like the preceding one, without result.

It remained for the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress—December 3rd, 1902, to March 4th, 1903—to break all anti-trust records. No less than four acts aimed at the trusts were passed at this session, and became law by the signature of the President. The first of these was an act to enable the Attorney-General to enforce the anti-trust laws, and was something of a surprise, not only to the public, but even to Congress itself. This was because the act was the sudden offspring of Democratic manœuvring, by which the Republicans were caught in a trap and forced to yield. In brief, the history of the bill is as follows: On December 17th, while the legislative, judicial and executive appropriation bill was under consideration, Mr. Bartlett,

of Georgia, offered an amendment proposing that $250,000 be placed at the disposal of the Attorney-General for the prosecution of violators of the anti-trust statutes. Mr. Bartlett stated as his reason for proposing this amendment the alleged declaration of the Attorney-General that the existing anti-trust laws were quite sufficient, and that only their proper enforcement was needed. He thought, therefore, that Congress should remove every excuse, and place at the Attorney-General's command the necessary means to enable him to enforce the laws properly and strictly. The proposed amendment disconcerted the Republican leaders in the House, and they were afraid to raise a point of order, although the Sundry Civil Bill, which had not then been reported, carried an appropriation for enabling the Attorney-General to enforce the anti-trust statutes. At this juncture, Mr. Cannon came forward and turned the Republican demoralization into victory. He accepted Mr. Bartlett's amendment, but proposed that the amount be increased to $500,000, and that it be made available at once. In this form the bill passed unanimously. It was the first anti-trust legislation in nearly ten years.

At the recent session of Congress, the House, upon motion of John Sharp Williams, adopted a resolution calling upon the Attorney-General to report what use he had made of this fund. Mr. Knox replied that only $25,985 of the amount had been used, most of which had been expended in the prosecution of the Northern Securities Company. The Democrats quickly turned this into political capital, and asserted that with almost unlimited means at his disposal, and with hundreds of trusts flourishing in violation of the law, the Attorney-General would not disturb them. At the recent session, Congress continued the appropriation, authorizing the expenditure of $85,000 for assistant attorneys in special cases.

The second anti-trust measure of the Fifty-seventh Congress was designed to meet the President's recommendation with regard to publicity. Early in the session Mr. Littlefield, who had come to be looked upon as the administration "trust buster" in the House, introduced an elaborate bill, requiring corporations engaged in foreign or inter-State commerce to make detailed returns to the Inter-State Commerce Commission of their business, under heavy penalties, forbidding the granting or acceptance of rebates in the matter of transportation charges, denying to trusts the use of the "facilities or instrumentalities" of inter-State commerce,

forbidding any common carrier to transport any property produced, manufactured or sold in violation of any of the anti-trust laws, and authorizing the recovery of treble damages in case of injury in consequence of anything done in violation of the act. It was, through and through, a good, stiff, thorough-going measure, no makeshift in any sense. On February 7th, 1903, it passed the House after little discussion by a unanimous vote.

In the Senate the bill encountered opposition from the first, and it was only reported from the Judiciary Committee after a number of important amendments had been added. In the mean time, the bill to create a Department of Commerce and Labor was under discussion, and Senator Nelson, of Minnesota, had drawn attention away from the Littlefield bill, by an amendment which he offered to the Department of Commerce and Labor bill, providing for a bureau of "publicity" in the proposed department. Thereupon, the President abandoned his advocacy of the Littlefield measure, and indicated his preference for the "Nelson Amendment." The Republican leaders in the Senate generally came to prefer the "Nelson Amendment" on account of its less radical character. It was widely reported at the time that the trusts themselves greatly preferred it, and that to insure its passage some of their magnates sent telegrams indiscriminately to Senators urging the Littlefield bill as a better measure. If true, this was a clever move; for, as soon as it appeared from the despatches that the trusts were opposed to the "Nelson Amendment," its passage was made certain. Finally, the Republican leaders professed to entertain doubts as to the constitutionality of the Littlefield bill, and the Attorney-General, who was regarded as an authority on such matters, expressed the opinion that a "coach-and-four could be driven through it endways." Mr. Nelson now offered his amendment as a substitute for the Littlefield bill, and it was accepted by the Senate. The House refusing to concur, the matter was sent to a Conference Committee, and its report substituting the "Nelson Amendment" for the Littlefield bill was adopted by a vote of 252 to 10. Of the ten negative votes, nine were Democrats and one a Republican (Mr. Littlefield). While all the Democrats who were present, except nine, voted for the "Nelson Amendment," because, as they said, the Republicans would offer nothing better, they denounced the measure as a sham and a makeshift—a "travesty on publicity," as one member put it.

The "Nelson Amendment" created a Bureau of Corporations in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to be presided over by a Commissioner, who is charged with making a diligent investigation into the business of corporations and joint stock companies engaged in foreign and inter-State commerce whenever he has reason to believe that they are violating the anti-trust laws of the United States. He is required to collect and lay before the President such information as will enable him to enforce the laws and make suitable recommendations to Congress. It cannot be denied that, as compared with the Littlefield bill, this is a very lame measure for getting at the trusts, and is likely, as many believe, to prove a disappointment to its authors. At the last session of Congress, a resolution was passed by the House of Representatives requesting the Bureau of Corporations to undertake an investigation of the "beef trust," and in April it was reported that such an investigation was actually under way. It was stated in the press despatches from Washington at the time that this investigation marked the "real beginning of the bureau's anti-trust work." Perhaps, therefore, it is too early to pass judgment on its merits.

A more efficient anti-trust measure was the Elkins Anti-rebate act approved February 19th, 1903. This measure passed the Senate unanimously, without debate or suggestion of amendment and without attracting attention. It passed the House in the same mechanical fashion and by a vote of 250 to 6. The chief purpose of this law is to prevent trust concerns from securing special freight rates from the railroads to the disadvantage of the small shippers. The theory underlying it is that, with equality of advantage as regards transportation facilities, the small or independent producer can prevent the trust from monopolizing the field and thus destroying competition. The act, therefore, forbids the offering as well as the receiving of rebates, punishes every deviation from published rates by a fine—not less than $1000 and not exceeding $20,000,—makes the corporation, as well as its agents, liable to prosecution for violation of the law, and contains detailed provisions for facilitating judicial proceedings under the act.

The necessity for this law was one of long standing. It is a matter of common knowledge that some of the most powerful industrial combinations in the country to-day have attained their

greatness largely as a result of favored treatment from the railroads. The Elkins act is no makeshift; it is a thorough-going measure, and, if enforced, will destroy a practice which has done much to enable the trusts to crush out their small competitors. Already, since its enactment, no less than fourteen great railroads have been restrained by injunction from granting rebates in violation of the law.

Finally, the anti-trust record of the Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, was completed by the enactment of a law to expedite the hearing and determination of suits arising under anti-trust acts. In brief, the act provides for the removal of trust cases pending in the Circuit Courts to a hearing before a bench of three judges and for carrying appeals from the Circuit Court directly to the Supreme Court. Resort has been had to this law but twice since its enactment.

No anti-trust legislation was enacted at the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, although the Democrats made an effort to secure the adoption of an amendment to the naval bill forbidding the Secretary of the Navy from entering into contracts with trusts and unlawful combinations. Mr. Williams in his speech, as temporary chairman of the St. Louis Convention, asserted that all the Republican members of the House, with three exceptions, voted against the proposition. One of the planks of the Democratic national platform condemns the "action of the Republican party in Congress in refusing to prohibit an Executive Department from entering into contracts with convicted trusts or unlawful combinations in restraint of inter-State trade." There are other planks denouncing trusts and rebates, and demanding an enlargement of the inter-State commerce law and the enactment of legislation along the lines of the Littlefield bill; but, strangely enough, the Republicans in Congress are directly arraigned only for the offence of refusing to prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from entering into contracts with combinations in restraint of trade.

Turning now from the activity of Congress to that of the courts, we find that the first two years of the period under review were practically barren of results. The first instance of an anti-trust prosecution during the period under review was in May, 1903, when the government obtained an injunction from the United States Circuit Court at Chicago restraining the so-called "beef

trust" from continuing its conspiracy in violation of the Sherman act. The defendants were specifically charged with directing their purchasing agents to refrain from bidding against each other; with bidding up temporarily to induce large shipments and then ceasing to bid in order to obtain the stock thus shipped at low prices; with agreeing among themselves upon prices, and with making agreements with transportation companies for rebates and other discriminative rates. Judge Grosscup held that these averments were sustained by the evidence and the injunction was issued. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court, before which it is now pending. In the mean time, the "publicity" bureau of the Department of Commerce and Labor is making its investigation of the operations of the "beef trust" and, it is hoped, will gather information sufficient to establish the government's case before the Supreme Court.

As already stated, railroad injunction suits are now proceeding in equity under the Anti-trust act against fourteen railroad corporations, of which eight are pending in the Circuit Court for the Western District of Missouri, and six before the Circuit Court for the Northern District of Illinois. The Attorney-General states that the object of these suits is to break up an unlawful combination between the railroad companies and certain favored shippers, whereby the latter were granted rebates or concessions from the published rates of the railroads for carrying grain and other products from one State to another. Other cases proceeding under the anti-trust act are the Jacksonville (Florida) Wholesale Grocers' Association, instituted for the purpose of dissolving a "combination of wholesale grocers;" the "cotton traffic pool cases" against the Western and Atlantic Railway Company, and a case against the Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis Railway Company, to restrain it from charging higher rates for short hauls than for long hauls. By a decision of the United States Circuit Court for the District of California, rendered in May, 1903, the Federal Salt Company and its associates were fined and enjoined from continuing their combination in violation of the Sherman act. By a decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting at Cincinnati, in December, 1903, the city of Atlanta was awarded treble damages against the "Pipe-Trust," in consequence of having been charged excessive prices for sewer-pipe. It was shown that the several constituent companies of the

trust, while making a show of bidding for the contract to supply the pipe, had in fact agreed among themselves that the Anniston, Alabama, branch of the combination should get the contract. At the recent term of the Supreme Court, several important anti-trust decisions were rendered. The first of these in chronological order was that of Montague *vs.* Lowry, decided on February 23rd of this year. Here an association had been formed of certain Eastern manufacturers of tile, mantels and grates, and of certain dealers in these articles in San Francisco and vicinity, and an agreement had been entered into among them by which the dealers agreed not to purchase from any manufacturer not a member, nor sell unset tile to any outsider except at prices fifty per cent. higher than those charged to members; while the manufacturers, on their part, agreed not to sell to any dealers not members. Both the Circuit Court and the Circuit Court of Appeals held that this association was a combination in restraint of trade among the States, and the Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the opinion. The penalties prescribed by the Sherman act were duly inflicted on the defendants.

A decision which has attracted wide attention, but which did not arise under the Sherman act, was that in the Inter-State Commerce Commission *vs.* Baird, commonly known as the "Anthracite-coal-carrying railroads case. This suit decided on April 4th of the present year grew out of a complaint made by Mr. W. R. Hearst against ten railroad companies engaged in carrying coal in the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland and West Virginia. He complained that the roads were charging unreasonable and discriminating rates, to the undue disadvantage of those consumers and producers of coal who were not common carriers, in violation of the Inter-State Commerce Act, and that six of the defendant railroads, natural competitors in the business of carrying anthracite coal from the regions of Pennsylvania to tide-water, were engaged in pooling their freight earnings and traffic also in violation of the Inter-State Commerce Act. In the course of the hearing before the commission, some of the witnesses refused to produce their contracts and to answer certain questions which were considered germane to the inquiry; whereupon the Attorney-General directed that proceedings be instituted in the United States Circuit Court in New York for the purpose of compelling the defendant companies to produce the papers de-

sired and answer the questions put to them. The Circuit Court decided against the right of the commission in the premises, whereupon an appeal was taken direct to the United States Supreme Court in pursuance of the act of February 9th, 1903, for expediting the prosecution of anti-trust suits. The Supreme Court overruled the decision of the Circuit Court, and sustained the right of the commission to compel the production of such testimony as might be deemed necessary to enable it to investigate the conditions under which inter-State traffic is carried on. Of course, no opinion on the merits of Mr. Hearst's charges was expressed. The decision is a substantial victory for "publicity"; and, besides strengthening the power of the Inter-State Commerce Commission, will incidentally strengthen the hands of the Bureau of Corporations. The coal trusts, and all others as well, may now be compelled to reveal whatever information of relevancy that the government may desire with regard to their operations.

Two weeks after the decision of the Supreme Court in this case, Mr. Williams, the minority leader in the House, secured the adoption of a resolution calling upon the Attorney-General to state whether the Department of Justice had ever undertaken any investigation of the so-called coal-trust-carrying railroads. Mr. Knox replied that such an investigation had been begun during the strike of 1902; but that it had not proceeded far before it was discovered that, if a combination existed, the evidence of its existence had been adroitly concealed. In view of the fact, therefore, that the Department of Justice possessed no power to compel the production of books and papers, or to examine witnesses under oath, he suggested that the Inter-State Commerce Commission should make a general investigation. Mr. Knox then recited the facts concerning the history of the investigation, ending with the decision of the Supreme Court alluded to above, and he concluded his reply as follows: "Further than this I do not deem it compatible with the public interest to comply with the resolution." The Democrats endeavored to make political capital out of the refusal of the Attorney-General to make a further disclosure of the proceedings of the Department of Justice with regard to the coal trust; and Mr. Williams, in his speech as temporary chairman of the St. Louis Convention, severely denounced the action of the Attorney-General and charged him with equivocation and indifference toward the coal trust. But to the

impartial student, Mr. Knox's communication appears highly creditable and convincing. It showed that his department had acted with energy, determination and success in its dealings with the coal trust.

Our review of the record of judicial activity concerning the trust question must end with a brief statement of the Northern Securities Case, finally disposed of by the Supreme Court in March of the present year. Here two great railroad systems, the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific, forming substantially parallel and competing lines extending from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean, with an aggregate length of ten thousand miles, having attempted to effect a consolidation and being thwarted by the action of the courts, conceived the idea of accomplishing the same end indirectly by placing the stock of the two roads in the hands of a holding company. Accordingly, a corporation of this character was organized under the laws of New Jersey; and to it the stock of the two roads was transferred in return for its own stock upon an agreed basis of exchange. The practical effect was to place the control of both roads in the hands of a single corporation and to substitute for two distinct sets of stockholders, with rival and competing interests, one set of stockholders with common interests. A multitude of suits was at once instituted against the "Merger"; and in due course of time one of them reached the United States Supreme Court, where a decision was rendered on March 14th of this year. The contention of the defendants was that there had been no intention on their part to monopolize trade among the States, but, instead, their purpose had been to create a vast trade with the Far West and with the Orient—to do which they must protect their Northern Pacific line from the hostile "raids" of those in control of the Union Pacific road. In support of their contention, they showed that the "Merger" had been followed by a large extension of American trade with the Orient, and that a considerable reduction in transportation rates had likewise resulted, as an example of which it was asserted that flour was being transported from points in the Mississippi valley to China, a distance of 8,000 miles, at the rate of eighty cents per barrel. Moreover, the defendants contended that the Northern Securities Company was only an investment Company, not engaged in the business of railroad transportation, and, consequently, that it did not possess the power to suppress competition, and that, even if

it did possess that power, it did not follow that the power would be exercised. It was insisted, furthermore, that Congress had no power to control the acquisition and ownership of stock in State corporations, and that the Sherman act, being a criminal statute, should be strictly construed and applied only to *unreasonable* restraints, not to such as were never objectionable at common law.

The Court, however, decided that most of the contentions of the defendants were immaterial to the decision, and that the others were untenable. It held that there was no distinction, in the present case at least, between the possession of power and the exercise of power; it declared that the question of whether the Sherman act applied only to unreasonable restraints had already become *res adjudicata* by previous decisions of the Court; and it asserted that the Northern Securities Company was merely a contrivance for effecting indirectly a purpose which could not be accomplished directly. With regard to their contention that the fundamental question involved was whether Congress had the power to regulate the acquisition, ownership and transfer of stock in State corporations, the Court undertook to show that such a statement of the issue was wholly misleading and unwarranted, and that it was merely setting up men of straw to be easily stricken down. The decree of the Court did not, as is often asserted, dissolve the Northern Securities Company, but merely enjoined it from voting the stock of the two roads, or from exercising any control over them.

According to the plan adopted by the directors for returning to the shareholders the stock given by them for Securities stock, each shareholder was given back, not his original stock in one road, but a proportionate amount of stock in both roads. The Harriman or Union Pacific holders protested against this method, since it would give them a joint interest in both roads instead of a controlling interest in the Northern Pacific, as they would have if each shareholder were given back his original stock. They went into the Federal Courts in Minnesota and the State Courts of New Jersey and made a determined fight against the Hill-Morgan method of redistribution, but they were beaten. They then betook themselves to the United States Circuit Court for New Jersey, and the case is now pending before that Court. The refusal of the courts to interfere with the *pro rata* method of redistributing the stock leaves the Northern Pacific road in

the hands of Mr. Hill and his friends, who also control the Great Northern.

It thus happens that, although the Northern Securities Company has been suppressed through the activity of the Attorney-General, the "community of interest" arrangement, which the Securities Company was designed to protect, still endures. On the other hand, if the Federal Court at Trenton should order the other method of redistribution, Mr. Harriman and his friends, who already control the Union Pacific, will gain control of the Northern Pacific, a parallel and competing line. It is doubtful, therefore, if the suppression of the Securities Company has availed anything after all. The reputed dictum of a Western jurist, that "this thing called a 'merger' will survive any law suit," is by no means without a modicum of truth.

Two other observations remain to be made on the Northern Securities decision. One is that the Court seems to lean toward the view that the application of the Sherman act should not be extended to *reasonable* restraints, or such as were never objectionable at common law. Justice Brewer's dissent on this point indicates that the majority of the Court have about come around to this more sensible view; but, as the other interpretation still stands as the law, Congress should amend the act so as to restrict its application. Reference to the debates shows unmistakably that those who had most to do with the framing of the law understood that it merely cast into statutory form the old doctrine of the common law relating to restraints of trade. As now interpreted, the law is too sweeping and is likely, if rigidly enforced, to work injury to legitimate business interests. At the last session of Congress, Senator Foraker undertook to have the act amended in this particular, but the proposition did not meet the approval of the administration, and was accordingly dropped.

The other query raised, is, whether the act was intended to apply to railroad "mergers," since, at the time of the enactment of the law, Congress well knew that the greater part of the railway system of the country rested upon such combinations, either expressly authorized or tacitly permitted by the States. If, therefore, Congress had intended to declare such arrangements illegal and the State legislation authorizing them unconstitutional, would it not have so declared in more specific language than is employed in the Sherman act? It is estimated that eighty-five per cent. of

the railway mileage of the United States is now being operated in violation of the Sherman act as at present interpreted, some of the "mergers" having taken place since the passage of the law, others before; yet none of them, except this one, has been disturbed by the government. The defendants in the Northern Securities case contended, throughout the prosecution, that it was unjust to single them out for punishment, while others were allowed to go free. Mr. Knox says that the government refused to give any heed to this contention; and the day following the announcement of the decision of the Supreme Court, he issued a statement giving the comforting assurance to the other "mergers" that they would not be disturbed. Having suppressed this one, he said, the government did not propose to run amuck.

The failure of the Attorney-General to prosecute those concerned in the Northern Securities "conspiracy" is another feature of the case that has been the subject of comment. The House of Representatives, a few weeks after the announcement of the final decision, passed a resolution calling upon him to state whether any criminal prosecutions had been instituted. He replied that there had not been, and further than that he did not deem it compatible with the public interest to comply with the resolution. He doubtless felt that the government, having vindicated the law, could afford to waive further punishment. But the Democrats criticised him for his leniency, and insisted that he should have seen to it that the penalties prescribed by the Sherman act were inflicted on those found guilty of violating that act.

Such, in brief, is the record. It includes four acts of Congress, various resolutions and not less than twenty judicial decisions. The majority, of course, will claim whatever credit may be due for what has been done. But the fact is, the minority party is entitled to share the honors. One of the four acts of Congress was conceived by a Democrat, and its passage was forced as a result of Democratic manœuvring. For each of the other three the Democrats voted with practical unanimity, after vainly trying to secure the adoption of amendments, some of which would have added much to the efficiency of the measures finally passed. Of the judicial decisions all were adverse to the defendant trusts, although, in a number of the cases decided, final hearings are yet to be had. All in all, encouraging progress has been made.

JAMES WILFORD GARNER.

THE EDUCATED AMERICAN DRUDGE.

BY ELIZABETH BANKS, AUTHOR OF "THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A NEWSPAPER GIRL."

"Toy!" "Beautiful Tyrant!" "Queen—with Man her willing slave!" It is by such names that the American woman is known abroad, especially in England.

The American man, engrossed in business, turned into a mere money-grubber for the benefit of his womankind, while she shines in society, travels in Europe and pursues the Cult of Culture—this is the picture of American life most frequently presented to the English people. They judge by what they see abroad, by the average travelling specimens. They have no other means of judging, since comparatively few English people come to the United States. When compared with these few English who come to America, the number of American women travelling abroad seems very large indeed. Yet, if these latter are compared with those American women who remain always in their own country, the number of the travellers is infinitesimally small.

While the American Toy, the American Tyrant and the American Queen sip ice-cream sodas through a straw in the Cecil courtyards, and make the welkins of the American Quick Lunch Restaurant in the Strand ring with their shrill orders for terrapin and soft-shell crabs, the American Drudge stays at home and keeps her house, and *she* is far more typically American. But the English people do not know her. As I have said, they judge by what they see abroad, not by a close study of American life in this American land, and they think the picture a realistic one, and so they talk and write of the American Type.

Having, during the past eleven years, resided in England, and having become, to a certain extent, English in my point of view of many matters, I have found myself, from time to time, think-

ing of my countrywomen as I have discovered them abroad, not as I left them at home in what seemed to me the very long ago.

I am of the Middle West; and, to be sure, once in a while there seemed to come to me a faint recollection of the sound of the scrubbing-brush, the rattle of the dish-pan, the swishing of brooms and dusters. They seemed to be in connection not with "the very poor," nor yet with the Western "hired girl," but with my old friends of earlier associations. There were visions of tired, worn faces, bent backs. The visions grieved and pained me; yet, being but faint ones, they did not affect me deeply, nor abide with me long. Sometimes I thought of our country parson's wife, who did all her housework, including the ironing of the parson's white neck-ties; took care of her three children; led the young people's meeting; presided every Sunday at the church organ; taught a Sunday-school class; looked after the sewing-circle; gave her children lessons in drawing and music; made her own and her children's clothes; and, from out of the multiplicity of all her other duties as housekeeper, mother and parson's wife, snatched a few minutes' time every day in which to keep up her German by reading a bit of Goethe or Schiller.

I was talking about her one day to an English clergyman, the editor of a prominent magazine, and he exclaimed:

"How very extraordinary! And may I ask if she was what in England we should call a 'gentlewoman'?"

"Oh yes," I answered. "She was the daughter of a lawyer. She was a graduate of Oberlin, and a woman whose surroundings were always of the most refined and intellectual."

"Dear, dear!" exclaimed he. "What a character for a study and a story! But in England nobody would believe her to be taken from life. We have poor clergymen here, very poor ones; but they always manage to keep a servant and a nurse. It is very pathetic, very pathetic!"

I, too, thought it "very pathetic," also "very extraordinary." I made myself believe that our parson's wife was different from all other parsons' wives. That the woman was average, or typical, I certainly should have denied.

And one day, a few months later, I received a letter from an old college mate, who, since I had seen her, had married, moved to a large Western town, and had three children. Apologizing for not having answered my letter long before, she said:

"My dear, you must not expect me to write to you often, for I am a busy Martha, as you would understand if you were not a literary bachelor woman. Of course, I keep up with my Latin, and I am refreshing my mind in regard to Botany, for my little girl is interested in it. But my time is quite full, what with the housework, the baking and mending, the making of all our clothes, and then I have my church and club and charity work. But I have a good washerwoman, so that I have only the ironing to do now."

An English friend was calling on me when I received the letter; and, feeling somewhat proud of what to me seemed the wonderful accomplishments of my old schoolmate, I read this part of the letter aloud to him.

"A college woman, did you say?" he said, looking bewildered.

"Yes," I answered, "one of the most brilliant minds I have ever known."

"I suppose she made an unfortunate marriage; perhaps she did not marry a gentleman; or perhaps they have become very poor? In that case, it is very remarkable, yet very fortunate, that she is thus able to help him on his feet again."

I explained that the girl had married a "gentleman," and that he belonged to what in England is known as the "professional class." Also, that they had not become "very poor"—quite the contrary. They were improving in their circumstances every year. Had she not said that *now* she had a washerwoman, implying that she had not always had one?

"You mean that a college woman began that sort of thing as soon as she was married—that she married expecting to do it?" he exclaimed. When I replied that I thought that was the case, his reply was:

"Of course, it is out of the ordinary, else it would do away with one's preconceived notions of the American man's treatment of his wife. But I assure you that it would be impossible to find in England a gentleman who would allow his wife to become a household drudge!"

I agreed with the Englishman that it was "out of the ordinary." I believed that I had an exceptional college friend, as well as having had an exceptional parson's wife; and then I returned to my native land, and, travelling in the Middle West and the Far West, I have had my mind disabused. The cases were

not unique. I have found them very common, so common that I would almost call them typical of a large majority of educated American married women in certain sections of the United States. Asked how these women have impressed me on my return to my own country, after more than a decade of wandering, I should unhesitatingly say: "They are household drudges."

Were I a painter, and did I wish to depict on canvas the typical American Wife, I should put a calico dress upon her, tie a gingham apron round her waist, and paint her with an intellectual face, all eager, searching—searching for dust.

"Being so British, you will like to see these," said a college woman to me a month or two ago when I was calling on her. She opened a parcel of a half-dozen Irish linen housemaids' aprons, with huge pockets and strapped bibs. "They are from Belfast. A friend brought them to me."

"What are they for?" I asked.

"For afternoons," she answered. "In the morning I wear the gingham ones, but there is always something to do."

Always something to do! It is well for every woman that she should have always something to do, but the something should not always require an apron.

Throughout the West, I met the Educated American Drudge in her hundreds. At times she seemed, in part, to realize what she was. At other times she seemed to live and work all unconscious of the depth of drudgery to which she had descended, especially if her husband helped her to beat the carpets, and hung up the clothes-line on a Monday morning before he went to business. For the Drudge's husband is "handy about the house."

The Educated Drudge does not have a large family. Her limit is three children. The average is two; indeed, statistics will probably show it to be but one and a half. It was at her, at least in part, that President Roosevelt levelled his accusation of contributing to Race Suicide, and thereby helping on the Survival of the Unfit.

It is true that the Educated Drudge has not done all that Nature, perhaps, intended and fitted her to do, in the way of increasing and multiplying after her kind and replenishing that part of the earth which she inhabits.

It is also true that in no country in the world, except the United States, will one find a woman in checked gingham apron

presiding at the wash-tub and stopping, between rubs, to go into the parlor to help her only little daughter over a difficult part of Schubert or Wagner at the piano! In no other country will one find a wife washing dishes, cooking, sweeping, dusting, scrubbing, putting patch upon patch and darn upon darn for ten hours during the day, then spending her evenings helping her two children with their lessons in Geometry and Physics.

And in no other country, except among the peasantry, will one find the mother of a three weeks' old infant doing her own housework and taking care of her child besides!

Of real rest, the woman has none. If she snatches an hour off from housework to don the pretty gown she has made for herself, and go to her club to listen to a paper on "The Duties of a Wife" or "Model Motherhood," the rush to get there and the rush to get back, "in time to have dinner on the table," adds to her weariness. If, instead of going out, she lies down in her bedroom for an afternoon nap, she hears piercing little cries of "Ma, where's my pants—the striped ones?" "Oh, mamma, help me to trim my dollie's hat!"

Drudge in the kitchen, she is also slave to her children, and up to the time which would seem to an English person a very mature age indeed, they occupy cots at night in the family bedroom, so that she may "keep the covers on them" and be sure that "nothing happens."

At first one is filled with pity, and then one is lost in admiration of the Educated American Drudge. In spite of the odds against her, she has so far held her own. That she has not degenerated is the wonder of the age. That part of the country which has produced women capable of taking their hands from the washboard to guide their children's fingers over the piano keys or add a finishing touch to a bit of charcoal-drawing, will surely one day produce something very magnificent, or something very terrible, in the way of a Woman.

A multiplicity of causes has contributed to the production of the present type, chief among which has been, during the past quarter of a century, the over-education of the Western women and the under-education of the men, which has brought about a large amount of mismating. Praise as we may the American system of "giving the first chance to the girls" and letting the boys, if need be, saw wood, we must admit, if we are honest, that

it has its disadvantages. It produces what, for want of a better term, we may call "two-thousand-dollar women," who, if they marry at all, must content themselves with marrying "one-thousand-dollar men," with the net result of household drudgery for the women. Let the thousand-dollar man be as "handy" as he may, and kind, as he usually is, he remains unobservant and obtuse. His obtuseness in the first place prevents his seeing the incongruity of the match he asks the woman to make; and, in the years that follow, he fails to observe the fact that she *is* a drudge; he fails to note that at thirty-five she looks forty-five, and at forty-five she is worn out and broken down.

And there seems to be in the American woman herself a natural tendency, a willingness—one might almost say anxiety—to be a drudge. Give her a servant, or two servants, and she remains Drudge-in-Chief. There is about her a certain primitiveness, a harking back to Puritan ancestors, that makes it difficult for her to learn that even a married woman may, under certain circumstances, have some higher duties than the "seeing to" her husband's dinner and the suckling of her child. Take her out of college and put her in a home, and it is difficult to convince her that the concentration of all her energies upon the elimination of a speck of dust is a bit of foolishness.

Given the same circumstances, the same surroundings and the same *apparent* necessity that have contributed to the making of the household drudge, as I have found her in the West, and I believe there is but one part of the United States where the Drudge would not become the real American Type, and that is in the South.

Outside the Southern States, the typical American woman is too solicitous a housewife, too anxious a housekeeper, altogether too much of a Martha, too contented a drudge. How she shall be freed is a question. Perhaps with the solution of the Domestic Service Problem, if it ever comes, will come her deliverance from drudgery.

ELIZABETH BANKS.

WORKING-MEN'S INSURANCE IN GERMANY.

BY DR. FRITZ KESTNER, OF THE IMPERIAL GERMAN COMMISSION TO THE INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT ST. LOUIS.

THE life of the modern industrial nations is fraught with social problems, one of the most difficult of which is the position of the industrial wage-worker. The only salable thing which the laborer possesses is his work; when he loses his working capacity he has lost everything. Therefore, it is even more necessary that the workman should be insured against the consequence of that loss than that the merchant should insure his goods.

It may be said that the working-man can save, as do other private citizens, and thus insure himself against the vicissitudes of life; but to save only a little from a small income is extremely difficult, and, in fact, experience has shown that only a small part of the laboring population of all countries provides for insurance spontaneously. An organization of workmen, a union, could certainly undertake the insurance of its members, and, indeed, some of the English trade-unions insure their members against sickness and invalidity; but a union is also a fighting organization, and it might easily happen that the amounts paid in by the working-men against the contingency of sickness would be used up during a strike. Moreover, from an ethical point of view, it appears to be unfair that the working-man should bear exclusively the risk involved in the danger of his avocation; the employer, to whom the factory belongs, and the community, which has the greatest interest in the welfare of the working population, should bear part of this burden. It is by no means sufficient that the Government institute a system for the care of the poor; for to depend upon charity demoralizes the workman.

In view of this fact, the Government in Germany has undertaken the task of regulating Working-men's Insurance by pro-

visions of law. The result is that in Germany 10,500,000 working-men and women are insured against sickness, 17,500,000 against accident and 13,500,000 against invalidity.

Labor questions are, really, however, international in their nature; just as no State is able to regulate its commerce and traffic without paying regard to other States, so it is with the labor question. International agreements are in progress for the protection of working-men. The question is whether this course would be likewise practicable in relation to the insurance of working-men. It was this consideration which led the German Imperial Government to institute, at the World's Fair in St. Louis, a comprehensive and thorough representation of the character and the organization of the German Working-men's Insurance.*

The fundamental principles underlying this working-men's insurance are, in short, as follows:

1. Insurance against accidents. Every person engaged in industry or agriculture, as a laborer, is insured against accidents met with in the pursuit of his business, provided that he has not caused such accidents by his own gross carelessness. The insured person, when injured, receives medical treatment free of charge; he will be, if possible, restored to health, and in the meantime he, as well as his family, will be supported. Should recovery be impossible, he will enjoy a pension so long as his working capacity remains impaired,—if necessary, to the end of his life. This pension, without exception, is so fixed that it will afford him two-thirds of the amount he could earn as a healthy person. A special system has been developed, based on experience, to determine to what degree the wage-earning capacity will be affected by the loss of a certain limb: for instance, the right thumb. The organization of this accident insurance is exclusively in the hands of the employers, upon whom alone, likewise, devolves the burden of the institution. It is a liberal principle of German law that whoever gives the occasion for a certain endangerment will also

* In the Building of Education and Social Economy an exposition of books, tables, photographs and statistics has been installed, wherefrom the student of these questions may derive rich material. To make this accessible to larger circles, five pamphlets were written by prominent experts, especially for the World's Fair, conveying a good and, notwithstanding the concise form, a thorough knowledge of the system. These pamphlets will be sent on request, free of charge, from the Office of the German Imperial Commissioner, Mr. Lewald, 4936 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

be liable for damage resulting therefrom. To lighten the burden of the individual employer, however, self-administering bodies have been created, "*Berufsgenossenschaften,*" comprising all employers of a certain branch of industry in a certain district, subject to insurance; for instance, all ironworks of the Rhenish Westphalian Industry District have formed one of these *Berufsgenossenschaften.* These associations fix the amounts required for the settlement of insurance claims, and assess them at the end of the year upon the individual employers.

The amounts raised in this manner by the employers are enormous. In 1902, they paid about $30,000,000 for the indemnification of 120,000 cases of accident, about $20,000,000 accident pension, and $5,000,000 to the survivors of victims of accidents.

2. Insurance against sickness. The insurance against sickness guarantees to the members insured medical treatment at home, or at a hospital, free of charge, the supply of medicine and, moreover, a sick-benefit for the support of the member insured and his family during the time of sickness. In many cases, also, women lying-in receive assistance before and after delivery. Such assistance is given for not more than six months. After that the person concerned will be transferred to the Invalidity Insurance. The insured under this head comprise all industrial laborers, likewise servants; agricultural laborers are taken care of in another manner.

While for Accident Insurance the means are raised exclusively by the employers, here the employee contributes two-thirds, the employer one-third. These contributions are paid in weekly instalments—immediately upon the payment of wages, as a rule. The administration is managed by the Sick Funds *(Krankenkassen).* The working-men of a certain factory, or, as a rule, of a certain place, belong to such a Sick Fund. The greatest local Sick Fund, the one in Leipzig, comprises 124,000 members.

3. Insurance against Invalidity. The third and most difficult institution is the insurance against infirmity arising from old age or invalidity, a specifically German institution.

Every member insured who has become invalid without his own fault, or who has completed his seventieth year, so that he no longer possesses his full working capacity, receives a cash pension proportional to the dues which he has paid, the dues, again, being regulated in proportion to the wages received by the workmen. The wage-worker who has been well paid, therefore, receives a

higher invalidity pension than his brother who earned lower wages, because the latter is used to a cheaper manner of living. Moreover, such pension increases with the number of years the member has paid his dues. This pension is never so high that it can support a person comfortably. Consequently, everybody in a morally sound nation will prefer working to simulating invalidity. What the insurance aims at, and really achieves, is to guarantee the workman a living. Everybody may tranquilly say unto himself: "The community will not allow you to starve when you are sick and old."

To administer this insurance, vast means and a comprehensive organization are required, for 490,000 Invalidity Pensions and 180,000 Old-Age Pensions are paid out annually. The means are raised by weekly contributions of the employers and employees, each paying one-half. The Empire pays an annual additional supplement of $12 on each pension. The disbursement of the pensions is effected by mail. For the administration, in some districts, special institutions *(Landes-Versicherungs-Anstalten)* have been constituted. In 1902, employers and employees raised $17,000,000 each, in addition to which the Empire paid a subsidy of $10,000,000. In 1901, approximately $100,000,000 was paid to the insured in three branches of insurance; in the decennium of its existence the insurance paid amounted to about $800,000,000.

Besides the administrative organization, there exists for all branches of workmen's insurance a juridical organization. As the pensions and indemnifications are in no sense pauper assistance, but legal claims that may be collected by procedure at law, the existence of a special course of jurisdiction is a necessity. It would lead too far to discuss these institutions: suffice it to state that, as a rule, three instances exist, whereof the first fixes the amount of the rent, the second examines the same in its actual and legal features, and the third and highest is competent for the final legal decision. This third and highest instance is the German Imperial Insurance Office in Berlin, under President Gaebel, at the same time an administrative body and a court of justice.

The organization of the Workmen's Insurance, as a whole, may be characterized as the exercise of social self-help, organized on the basis of regulations bearing the character of public law. It is not, as often erroneously thought abroad, an insurance by the State, but an insurance by the interested parties themselves, through the medium of vital corporations which are standing be-

tween State and individual, and which are charged with the execution of the insurance.

But as is often the case with brilliant creations, results are hereby secured which originally were not considered at all, but which more than anything else illustrate the great importance of the institutions.

In the first place, accident insurance has led to a thorough improvement of measures for the prevention of accidents, and to the elaboration of careful regulations concerning such precautionary measures. While this may be taken for granted, the working-man has not become more careless, as accident insurance will compensate him only for a part of his wages; the employers have become more provident, and likewise more zealous and conscientious in the application of preventive measures. Not only the individual employer now has an interest in this matter, but also all employers of the *Berufsgenossenschaft* participating in the burden. This *Berufsgenossenschaft,* therefore, supervises the establishments of its members through special officials, and has the right to impose fines for neglect of their rules. Moreover, when many accidents happen in a particular branch of business the *Berufsgenossenschaft* will declare the same to be dangerous, and will levy higher dues for the coming year on members engaged in it. As a result of this insurance, a special highly developed technique for the prevention of accidents has arisen which intends to apply to the machinery contrivances for the protection of the working-men operating such machinery, to improve the ventilation of the factory rooms, to remove all obnoxious gases and, generally, to improve the hygienic conditions. Prizes are awarded for the invention of such constructions, lectures concerning these matters are delivered, numerous technical books and magazines take up this question. So it is a fact that accidents are on the decrease, notwithstanding the growing industrialization of the country.

The insurance against sickness has brought about an essential improvement of the national health. By consulting the physician in time a great number of diseases may be suppressed in the incipient stage, which if neglected would later on prove disastrous. The working-man who heretofore for the sake of economy hesitated to call in a physician, now will consult him at once, since he receives his advice free of charge.

In this manner many cases of grave sickness are avoided. In

conjunction with other sanitary measures, the erection of convalescent homes, the spreading of popular information concerning diseases, this system has effected a considerable reduction of the mortality rate in Germany.

The great accumulation of funds serves for purposes conducing to the public welfare. The amounts disbursed as dividends to the stockholders in private insurance, the reserve funds, and funds that in other insurance are invested in securities, may here be used for sanitariums, working-men's dwellings, public libraries and similar improvements.

The capital of the Workingmen's Insurance amounts to $300,000,000, an amount never at the disposal of an individual for charitable purposes.

Besides these material advantages, others of a spiritual character are to be appreciated. In the different instances and administrative bodies, the working-man participates in the administration, while otherwise, on account of his insufficient training and lack of means, he would have no opportunity for such matters. So engaged, he learns to appreciate and master the peculiar difficulties inherent in large administrative bodies—certainly a good school for his duties as a citizen.

Finally, we should not under-estimate the enormous enrichment of our knowledge of social and economical processes through this system. In no country have the statistics concerning accident, sickness and wages been perfected to such a degree.

Even the German system of Workmen's Insurance is not without defects. Up to this time, only the survivors of persons killed by accident are indemnified. Now the principal endeavor in this line is to extend such insurance to the wives and children of all working-men in case of the death of the father of the family. It will probably be only a few years until this insurance of widows and orphans is an enforced law. Even then the great problem of insurance against lack of employment remains to be solved. Whether the state could enact such insurance, or this should rather be left to the working-men's organizations, is an open question.

Opposition of various kinds had to be overcome before this organization was effected in Germany. The Radicals, for instance, were afraid that the unions would suffer irreparable injury, should this important function of providing for the working-men be taken away from them. But to the union, in the meantime, is

left the protection of the working-man against lack of employment; and, in fact, these organizations have enjoyed continuous and progressive development in Germany. Another objection was that the economy of the individual would decrease, but never have the deposits in the savings-banks shown such an upward tendency as in the last years. The employers anticipated that, by this encumbrance, they would be handicapped in their competition with foreign countries, but never has German industry enjoyed such prosperity as since the introduction of the insurance. This certainly means a burden for the individual employer, but this encumbrance is counterbalanced, nay, by far outweighed, by the advantages which accrue to the community.

As a recently deceased German author and patriot wrote in his last work, dedicated to the United States of America: "The palm of victory will be secured in the end by the nation possessed of the largest reserve of national health and power."

The German Workmen's Insurance has stood the test of probation in Germany. While the first law was passed by an insignificant majority, the passage of the last was effected by an almost unanimous vote.

Foreign countries are beginning to imitate this system. And now this is one of the most important questions: Could a similar system of insurance be adopted by the United States? One of the greatest German experts, the former president of the German Imperial Insurance Office, Mr. Boediker, stated on June 20th, 1902, at the International Congress for Working-men's Insurance at Düsseldorf, with reference to America:

"I am convinced that, if the idea once gains a footing in America, the Americans will cultivate the soil with the expenditure of money and energy customary with them. We see how the Americans accept European ideas on land and on water at an enhanced rate, and I think if they once begin to work in this province they will do their best to prove that they are not inferior to us in this respect.

"Then the American workmen will also obtain their due share and then the words will be fulfilled which I uttered on another occasion: 'The idea of the insurance of the workmen will take its victorious course around the whole World!'"

Whether President Boediker is right the future will show.

FRITZ KESTNER.

THE HYPERBOLICAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS.

BY W. G. BALLANTINE.

CAN any of the practical questions of society be settled mechanically and infallibly, without the labor of observing facts or the responsibility of forming a judgment, by simply opening the Bible? Is Divorce such a question? There is a widespread impression that it is.

In a recent number of "Harper's Weekly," the Rt. Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., Bishop of Albany, expressed himself as follows:

"There is a grave question, and the question is growing graver, whether there is any Scriptural sanction for dissolving the bond of marriage for any cause whatever. But there is no question that the Scriptures do not recognize any cause except adultery as making a divorce possible. In all other cases it must be only a separation. My own conviction is that the bond is indissoluble except by death. Surely the Christian sentiment of thoughtful men might come to feel the danger of going beyond the letter of Scripture. This would considerably reduce the frequency of divorce, although it would still leave untouched the scandal of collusion, and the difficulty of finding what is called the innocent party in a divorce suit."

In so speaking, the distinguished Bishop voiced, with unusual clearness and impressiveness, a sentiment rapidly growing among Christian people. Similar expressions have been coming fast from other eminent religious leaders and from ecclesiastical bodies of many denominations. Startled by frequent scandals in "high life" and the steady increase of divorces among all classes, the national conscience calls for emphatic reaffirmation of the sacredness of the marriage tie.

But is there not a danger that, in following the letter, we may miss the spirit of Jesus, and by a Draconic severity make a bad matter worse? The assumed principle that it is dangerous for

Christian men "to go beyond the letter of Scripture" may lead to embarrassing consequences. The inquiry arises how it is known that the words of Jesus in this regard were meant to be understood as legislation. It would be unfortunate to sound the bugle for a united stand upon impossible ground.

Jesus used an extraordinary rhetoric. For he had a unique purpose. It was nothing less than to give spiritual liberty to a world bound hand and foot in the grave clothes of Talmudic literalism. He refused to be made a judge or divider among men. His was a far more exalted and spiritual and permanent function. During his whole life, he fought against the tyranny of mere words, and for the lordship of the present living spiritual man. In his discourses he suggested great truths by parables, by questions, by metaphors, by paradoxes, by hyperboles, by every device that could elude the semblance of fixed judicial formulas. It is the irony of history that such language should be seized upon for statute law. Jesus did not intend to save us from the trouble or the responsibility of dealing with concrete situations, but he did intend to give us the heavenly point of view.

Even the hastiest reader of the Gospels sees that Jesus, in his teaching, constantly used the rhetorical figure which is called Hyperbole, a figure the most unsuitable conceivable for the language of laws. The word "hyperbole," derived from two Greek words meaning *to throw beyond,* is defined in the Century Dictionary as "an extravagant statement or assertion not intended to be understood literally." Jesus apparently aimed to startle into thought the most indolent people, and to infix his suggestions into the memories of the most forgetful. His remarks often lack wholly the characteristics of careful definitions, and seem rather, as Matthew Arnold so well expressed it, "words flung out" toward great ideas.

Whatever may have been the reason for using this surprising rhetorical figure, it undeniably abounds in the discourses of Jesus. It makes all attempts at consistent literalism hopeless, and it leaves the reader in many cases at a loss for any explanation. Men who are going to argue from the sayings of Jesus, and to plead with churches and states to erect those sayings into laws, should first survey this whole field of hyperbole and fix upon some consistent and thorough-going method of treating it. It would be no more unreasonable to take Emerson's motto, "Hitch your wagon to a

star," as a prosaic direction to teamsters, and to paint it on a board alongside of "Walk your horses" and "Keep to the right," than to take the sublime hyperboles of Jesus for laws.

It is the purpose of this paper to consider enough of the words of Jesus to make it plain that nobody takes all of them in their bald, literal sense, that most Christians treat a large part of them as figurative, and that it is purely a matter of human judgment which, if any, shall be enforced as practical rules. Such being the case, the mere opening of the Gospels to the utterances of the Master concerning divorce cannot settle for us what should be the law of our land. Nothing can relieve us from balancing the interests at stake; and at the end we must decide, at our peril, whether the letter of Scripture is the right law for America today. This is a responsibility that cannot be shirked.

Jesus said: "If any man come to me, and *hate* not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv., 26). This is most extraordinary language in regard to entrance upon a life of love. A young Christian worker, an assistant-secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, once expressed to the writer a great desire to study the Greek language, and he mentioned this text as a reason. He was sure that the Greek word "to hate" must have some occult meaning not belonging to its English equivalent. The positive assurance that hate in Greek was just the same as in English left him unconvinced. He could not hate his wife in the plain English sense of the word.

Jesus said: "There are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mothers' womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it" (Matt. xix., 12). All students of church history know that the greatest of Alexandrian biblical scholars, the illustrious Origen, accepted this passage literally, and acted upon it. But the church of the third century rejected his interpretation and condemned this "inconsiderate and misdirected heroism," as he himself also did in riper years.

Jesus said: "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and

cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell" (Matt. v., 29, 30). But no one of us would encourage a young man, who, finding temptation through the eye dangerous to purity, should propose to destroy his own sight, or who should, under any circumstances, amputate his right hand. These suggestions of self-mutilation strike us as so manifestly hyperbolical that we are wholly at a loss to understand the infatuation of the monks and nuns, the penitents and pillar-saints, of the centuries of asceticism. Uncounted thousands of Christians could say with Saint Simeon of the pillar:

> "Bear witness, if I could have found a way—
> And heedfully I sifted all my thought—
> More slowly-painful to subdue this home
> Of sin, my flesh, which I despise and hate,
> I had not stinted practice, O my God."

Those poor, deluded, self-torturing souls thought that they had the authority of Jesus for what they did.

Jesus said: "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also" (Matt. v., 39, 40). Tolstoy, the noblest living Russian, in genius and in heart, takes these commands literally. He teaches that we should act upon them and leave the results with God. Fortunately, he has a wife, who, if open to the charge of worldly-mindedness, has certainly ordinary common sense, and thus the grand old idealist is protected from want. To the mass of Christian men the thought of allowing the criminals and ruffians of the world to seize our property, reduce us to destitution, abuse our wives and children, and knock us about at their fiendish pleasure, seems sheer insanity. Bishop Doane, we doubt not, would be among the last to have patience with such a proposition. But it must be observed that the command of non-resistance comes in the same discourse with the utterance on divorce, which the Bishop thinks that all Christian men might see the danger of not obeying to the letter. There is nothing in the Gospel to indicate that one passage is law and that the other passage is not law. Our only way to discriminate here is to appeal to some fallible human judgment. And this is what every seeker for light will

finally come to recognize: it is not enough to know the words of Jesus, but among those words some bishop, commentator or ecclesiastical assembly must select for us those which literally state our duty, while the others are explained as figurative.

Jesus said: "Swear not at all" (Matt. v. 34). He made no exceptions whatever. The Quakers regard themselves as bound by the prohibition, and to them the privilege of affirmation in place of an oath has been conceded. But, in spite of the precise words of our Lord, most of us think that when Theodore Roosevelt solemnly swore to support the Constitution of the United States and faithfully to administer the great office of President, he did an appropriate and Christian thing. We take comfort in the fact that he is under oath. The fact that Jesus, in prohibiting oaths, mentioned no exception gives us no uneasiness.

Jesus said: "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbors; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just" (Luke xiv. 12, 13, 14). The language here is exclusive and it covers both dinners and suppers. Taken literally, it rules out all the pleasant dinner and supper parties among relatives and friends, which constitute so large a part of the relaxation and joy of life. Such an institution as the American Thanksgiving day, with its reunions of family circles and congenial friends around the fragrant turkey and mince pie, can no longer be countenanced by Christian people. Social feasting is permissible only with defectives and dependents.

Jesus said: "Call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven" (Matt. xxiii. 9). Here one of the most tender and beautiful titles in the home is absolutely forbidden. Every time a little child says "*father*," he violates the letter of this command. Every time we lovingly bestow this title on some venerable minister of Christ, we disobey the words of the Master.

Jesus said: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Matt. xix. 24). The unwearied attempts of commentators to diminish the size of the "camel" here, or to enlarge the "needle's

eye," can only excite a smile. Sometimes we are told that the camel was a rope, and sometimes that the needle's eye was a gate through which a camel, by getting down on his knees, could pass, —anything, to escape, if possible, the astounding hyperbole.

Jesus said: "Sell that which ye have and give alms" (Luke xii. 33). The notion that a Christian must give away all and enter upon a life of poverty is based upon numerous similar unqualified assertions and commands. The opinion that a Christian should retain his property and administer it for God must be supported upon implications and inferences. Here, as in other matters, the path of duty is not ascertained for us by the precise words of Christ, but by our own judgment of what, in our circumstances, he would approve.

Jesus said: "Give to him that asketh thee" (Matt. v. 42). He made no exceptions. Josiah Flynt has told us that there is, or was a few years ago, in the United States, an army of 60,000 idle and depraved tramps, supported in their filth and wickedness by the unintelligent kindness of Christian people. As a rule each one of these tramps secures by begging, on the average, three "square" meals and a drink of whiskey a day. Of the folly of thus maintaining these worthless creatures it is hard to speak patiently. Yet the well-meaning people who give to them are literally obeying the command of Jesus.

Jesus said: "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (Luke xiii. 33). John the Baptist, the greatest of the prophets, had just perished out of Jerusalem.

The most perplexing hyperboles of Jesus are those in which he spoke of the power of faith and prayer. He said: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. xviii. 19). "Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you" (Matt. xvii. 20). "If ye had faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you" (Luke xvii. 6). "And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive" (Matt. xxi. 22). Any attempt to consider these promises literally will seem to many to savor of irreverent levity. To suggest that no Christian

would propose to remove by prayer the mountains that stand in the way of the Panama Canal or that obstruct the irrigation of the Western deserts, or would expect to transplant trees into wastes where the poor might find homes,—to say anything of this kind sounds like profane cavilling. But let us candidly face what is involved in admitting this. If the proposal to take literally certain often-repeated promises of Jesus is indignantly repelled as jesting about holy things, then is not the claim that we must go by the very letter of Scripture very much weakened?

We confess that we have difficulty in interpreting these limitless promises to prayer. President Garfield lies dying, while all the Christians of America pray for his recovery with a unanimity with which never any one man was prayed for before. But he dies. The same thing happens in the case of President McKinley. His wound does not even begin to heal. Millions die in India of famine and plague, while all the missionaries, men and women of God, surely, unite in agonizing prayer for rain and health. Slowly and with infinite anguish the human race advances along the path of progress. Consumption and cancer, ignorance and ferocity, the Czar and the Sultan continue from generation to generation. One thing is certain after two thousand years of trial. Those promises do not mean for us what their words seem to say. The common opinion is that the man who takes the words of Christ literally, and refuses to use anything but prayer for his sick child, deserves to be prosecuted for manslaughter.

One is astonished at the tone in which Jesus sometimes spoke of his own purpose and mission upon earth. He said: "I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what will I, if it is already kindled?" "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division" (Luke xii. 49, 51). "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword" (Matt. x. 34). "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one" (Luke xxii. 36). We tell the objector that Jesus in these passages, by a bold rhetorical figure, puts the unintended and lamented result for the purpose. What he means is that the wickedness of men converts his peaceful mission into a *casus belli*. None the less, in so explaining, we admit that Jesus did not literally say what he meant and did not literally mean what he said.

Even if all thoughtful Christian men were to-day united in a

resolute purpose of conformity to the letter of Scripture, the path of duty would be far from plain. Bishop Doane says: "There is a grave question, and the question is growing graver, whether there is any scriptural sanction for dissolving the bond of marriage for any cause whatever. But there is no question that the Scriptures do not recognize any cause except adultery as making a divorce possible. In all other cases it must be only a separation. My own conviction is that the bond is indissoluble except by death." Why is there a grave question, growing graver, about the scriptural sanction? It is because we are not sure what the letter of Scripture, in this case, is. The prohibition of divorce, as reported in the Gospels of Mark and Luke, makes no exception. In the Gospel of Matthew, however, Jesus is reported to have said, "Every one that putteth away his wife, *saving for the cause of fornication,* maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery." And in another passage, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *except for fornication,* and shall marry another committeth adultery." It is hard to decide what to think of this exception in Matthew. The word "fornication" seems inappropriate and inexplicable in the connection. To many textual critics it appears more probable that some unauthorized person inserted those strange words into the manuscript of the Gospel of Matthew, than that Mark and Luke both omitted them, if Jesus really spoke them. The learned Bishop tells us that, personally, he shares that opinion. He does not believe that Jesus ever made any exception. The letter of Scripture, therefore, to which the practice of the general Christian world is to conform is not that of the true tradition as given in Mark and Luke, but the letter of what scholars, in technical language, call "a corrupt text," as given in our present imperfect manuscripts of Matthew. Such a proposal cannot excite much enthusiasm. There would still be a double standard; one for the scholarly few, the other for the unscholarly multitude.

Suppose, however, that Christians generally retain the old view that Jesus did speak the words recorded in Matthew, and that by "fornication" he meant adultery; shall they in practice apply Jesus' own hyperbolical definition of adultery? He said, "I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. v. 28). No court would admit evidence as to wanton looks and

secret thoughts. Literalism must stop short of this. But this hyperbolical definition of adultery is part of a paragraph that includes the supposed legislation of Jesus. If one part is treated as rhetorical and the other as legislative, it must be on our own responsibility.

Suppose, on the other hand, such a diffusion of critical learning and such a firmness of principle as to make possible a united forward movement to the high plane of Mark and Luke, would the course be then clear? By no means. We should still have the words, "What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Now, to "put asunder" and to "separate" are precisely the same thing. It is merely an accident that our English translators used "put asunder" here and did not use "separate," as they did in translating the same word in other passages. For the Greek word that Jesus uses is not the legal term for divorce, but the ordinary word for parting company. In order, therefore, to escape the danger of going beyond the letter of Scripture, the law would have to require that two persons, once married, should not only never be divorced, but never for any reason *separated*. This is, manifestly, a requirement beyond the power of human nature. And at this point the practical good sense of Bishop Doane carries him right athwart the letter. He says, "In all other cases [except that of adultery] it must be only a separation." Could there be a more refreshing proof of the impossibility of consistent literalism? Start with whatever iron purpose one may, common sense somewhere breaks the chain. That which Jesus verbally forbids is just what the Bishop, in his wisdom, sees "*must be* in all other cases." Of course.

Jesus is the poorest possible authority for a literalist. He says the most unqualified things, and then never seems bound by them. Jesus said: "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do" (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3). He said: "Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 18, 19). Language could not be more positive. Yet face to face with concrete cases, Jesus never could be made to obey the scribes or to act as a legalist. To Jesus, a law was never a formula of words,

but the ideal aim of the lawgiver. The Sabbath law, "Thou shalt not do any work," made no exceptions for deeds of necessity or mercy. But Jesus, after the most solemn proclamation that not the dot of an *i* or the cross of a *t* should pass away, could see in the Fourth Commandment no reason why his hungry disciples should not provide themselves food, or why he should not go on healing diseases. The presence of the living man for whose benefit laws are made abrogates all apparent restrictions upon that benefit. Words may take care of themselves.

The law of Moses prescribed in detail what a Jew might eat and what he might not eat. Jesus by a word brushed away two chapters of the Pentateuch, "making all meats clean"; and yet he would not admit that a jot or tittle of the law had passed. When the scribes and the Pharisees brought to him a woman taken in adultery, they thought that for once Love must side with Hate, and that he who never yet had spoken a harsh word about a woman must give leave to cruelty to have its way. The law of Moses was plain. The penalty was stoning. The proof of the crime was indisputable. But Jesus, with all his positiveness about the least commandments of the law, could see no reason, in those circumstances, why that poor woman should be stoned.

The notion that the interests of certain individuals must be sacrificed in order that the community may live under good general rules finds no support from Jesus. The sanctity of marriage and of the home in the first century did not, in his thought, demand that he should crush that wretched victim of man's impurity. Perhaps, in present conditions, the State must content itself with the imperfect justice of hard rules. But there is something out of character when Christian leaders, in the name of Jesus, cry out for laws more inexorable and undiscriminating. If Jesus were present in one of our court-rooms to-day, and a heart-broken girl should come in, pleading for release from some brute unfit to be her husband, one whom God never joined to her, and if the self-constituted defenders of the home stood around and insisted upon the letter of Scripture,—a fate worse than stoning,—may we not believe that the Master would say again: "Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way"?

To what point has our investigation brought us? To the conclusion that the teachings of Jesus have no value? Far from it. They have an infinite value. But they lie in a plane above that

of legislation. Laws must be fitted to their times. Ideals are like the stars. Jesus did not say that Moses made a mistake in giving to the ancient Hebrews a divorce law such as their low state of refinement made alone workable. It does not appear that Scripture contains ready-made rules for our use. In laying down maxims for individual conduct, and laws for church and state, we are bound only to the application of a Christian judgment to the interests involved. The belief of some Christians that they have divine sanction for their particular expedients, is a most serious misfortune for all concerned. It obstructs the cooperation of good people. It brings a confusing element into the discussion.

The Christian sentiment of thoughtful men is already pretty unanimous in feeling that, in regard to oaths, war, poor-relief, and a multitude of matters, we cannot throw off the responsibility of acting upon our own best judgment in view of existing conditions. The hyperbolical utterances of Jesus on these subjects are not looked upon as requiring, or even justifying, a mechanical conformity to the letter of Scripture. Is it too much to hope that a day will come when good men will lay aside the claim to infallibility in all other matters, and when ecclesiastical bodies will cease to clamor for the enforcement of "the scriptural rules" regarding divorce, or anything else? In that good time, all thoughtful and earnest men, meeting in the forum of fraternal debate, with the modesty becoming those consciously liable to mistake, and the courage of those strong to do the right as God gives to them to see the right, will, by courteous comparison of arguments based upon existing facts, reach such harmony in practical legislation as shall secure kindness and justice for the unfortunately married, and shall promote progress toward the ever unattainable ideals of Jesus.

W. G. BALLANTINE.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *August, 1904.*

RARELY have English politics been more tense, more intricate or more baffling than at this moment. The confusion of uncertainties and speculation in which they are enveloped dates back, of course, to Mr. Chamberlain's speech in May of last year. The essence of that speech was that perseverance in Free Trade meant for Great Britain a progressive commercial decline, and for the British Empire disintegration. It pointed directly to a reversal of the fiscal system which has obtained in England since 1846 as the only means by which the Imperial connection could be maintained. Unless Preferential Tariffs with the Colonies were quickly established, the Colonial Secretary was "sure we shall fall to pieces and into separate atoms." Nor was that any new idea with Mr. Chamberlain. It had been growing on him ever since he entered the Colonial Office in 1895; in 1902 he gave public expression to it; and within the Cabinet he fought hard to get a portion of the tax on corn and flour remitted for the benefit of Colonial exporters. It was rather circumstances than any inherent novelty that caused his speech in May, 1903, to turn so tremendous a page, not only in British fiscal policy, but in Imperial relations.

For one thing, domestic politics had reached a transitional stage. After the fierce passions of the Boer War and the Education Bill, there was a sort of lull. The "man in the street" found politics very far from exciting and only mildly interesting. He was concerned with Somaliland; he had an eye on the London Education Bill; he was pondering the Irish Land Bill. But none of these things keenly engaged him. The political waters ran placidly enough to the outward eye, though with a strong under-

current that the Government found difficulty in gauging. The Opposition were as divided as ever. In all its essentials the situation was pretty much as it had been for five years and more. No moment could have been more opportune for the announcement of a new departure. Again, a peculiar interest attached to Mr. Chamberlain's speech. It was the first he delivered after his return from South Africa, from that famous tour which all England had followed with pride and applause. Everything therefore combined to lend to his words an unusual publicity and weight. The occasion was, in itself, out of the ordinary; but there was probably no one in England who expected to see it put to such amazing uses or lead to such cataclysmal results. Mr. Chamberlain had not consulted any of his colleagues in the Cabinet before making his speech. It took them as completely by surprise as it took the country. Even the preliminary paragraph in the papers that prepared the world for Mr. Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule was wanting. There was no forewarning whatever. It was soon evident that Mr. Chamberlain had no clear conception of what he was proposing, and that the celerity with which Parliament and the country caught him up, demanded details and the formulation of his suggestions in a cut-and-dried scheme, somewhat took him aback. Mr. Chamberlain had no cut-and-dried scheme to produce. Except in a general way, he had not thought the matter out. I do not mean that Mr. Chamberlain was speaking idly or carelessly when he announced his intention of saving the Empire by a system of Preferential Tariffs. What he said at Birmingham he sincerely and, indeed, passionately believed, but he had no prevision that in saying it he was about to convulse the country and the whole Empire, or that the response and the challenge would be so swift and overwhelming. But Mr. Chamberlain went off at half-cock, and it is this which explains the extraordinary immaturity of his initial proposals—his pledge, for instance, that the proceeds of the new corn tax should be devoted to an old-age-pension fund. Only the characteristic boldness of the man and his instant resourcefulness concealed, or partly concealed, the fact that behind his Birmingham speech lay not a definite policy but an idea more or less loosely grasped. Within a week it had become patent that the most forceful of English statesmen had raised and would not desert the tattered banners of Protection and Imperial Preference.

The shock was electric, incredible. There had always been a leaven of unconverted Protectionism in the Conservative party; the territorial type of legislator, here as everywhere, always, in his moments of unguarded instinct, talks Protection. There were even members of Parliament, like Mr. Chaplin and Mr. Lowther, who had won a sort of antiquarian interest by publicly and consistently championing the cause. In the eighties, under the speciously attractive name of Fair Trade, there was a movement, fought tooth and nail and with surpassing brilliancy by Mr. Chamberlain himself, that in its essence was purely Protectionist. But nothing at the beginning of last year seemed more unlikely than its revival as a political issue. Even the convinced relics of the Protectionist cause had long ago abandoned all hope of seeing it once more a vital question. Both parties had seemingly accepted Free Trade as something, like the Monarchy, fundamental, beyond argument.

Beyond all hope the Liberals found themselves once more united,—united at any rate for the negative purpose of opposition to Protection. But it was not upon them but upon the Government that public attention and speculation were concentrated. It was known that within the Cabinet itself there were many who would abandon office rather than be accomplices to a reversal of the Free Trade system. It was equally known that Mr. Chamberlain's programme had the enthusiastic backing of a large number of the rank and file not only in the Cabinet but in the party. How would Mr. Balfour be able to reconcile the two factions? Would he adopt or would he disavow the policy of his Colonial Secretary? Scarcely anybody perceived that there was a third alternative, that Mr. Balfour might go too far to satisfy the Free-Traders and not far enough to satisfy Mr. Chamberlain, and that the upshot would be the resignation of the leaders of both sections. This, as everybody knows, is what actually happened; but before it happened six crucial months passed by, during which Mr. Balfour partially disarmed the Opposition and held the malcontents in his own party in check by ordering an official "Inquiry" into the state of British commerce, and by taking the fullest advantage of the forms of Parliamentary procedure to burke discussion in the House of Commons. Then as now Mr. Balfour's indecision, or the appearance of it, contrasted piquantly enough with Mr. Chamberlain's absolute assurance and activity. Mr. Chamberlain

went straight ahead. He promptly organized the Tariff Reform League to advocate his views. No wealthier, no more perfectly equipped, no more ebullient body has ever come within the range of my political experience. In a very few months it had covered England with a network of branch societies; its lecturers, canvassers, agents and leaflets pervaded every nook and corner of the land. And there can be no question that the sweeping boldness of Mr. Chamberlain's policy, the high Imperial note he injected into it, the depth and fervor of the popular confidence in him as a man of affairs, his telling and persuasive oratory, and the feverish zeal of his supporters did for a while make an immense impression on the country. Even now the Free-Traders are not one-half so well organized for the battle as were the Protectionist forces within six months of Mr. Chamberlain's speech. So great was the flow of subscriptions and donations into the exchequer of the Tariff Reform League, so multiplying the tokens of approval and support, that even Mr. Chamberlain was deceived by them. When he started on his campaign he freely confessed in private that he had no hope of winning the next election, and that his eye was really fixed on the election after next. But at the end of six months, and on the very eve of a series of crushing by-elections, he wrote to a friend that he was convinced he would win even at the first trial of strength. He has now reverted to his original forecast.

Meanwhile, amid a growing intensity of popular interest, the struggle in the Cabinet continued. In September came the inevitable rupture. On the Protectionist side Mr. Chamberlain, and on the Free Trade side Mr. Ritchie, the Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord George Hamilton, the Secretary for India; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, the Secretary for Scotland; Mr. Arthur Elliot, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and, shortly afterwards, the Duke of Devonshire, left the Government. At the same time, in letters that passed between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain, it was clearly shown that the former was in whole-hearted sympathy and agreement with the latter's policy of Colonial Preference based on a tax on food, and only did not adopt it as the official policy of the Government because he was convinced that public opinion was not yet ripe for it. In the same letter, and in a pamphlet that was published simultaneously, Mr. Balfour, while opposed to food taxes, declared himself and his Government in

favor of Retaliation. This policy he publicly developed a few weeks later at Sheffield. He asked the people of the country "to reverse, to annul and delete altogether from their maxims of public conduct the doctrine that you must never put on taxation except for revenue purposes." That is to say, he threw overboard the fundamental principle of Free Trade and proposed to substitute for it the principle of Retaliation. Except vaguely we do not know how much this latter principle is to be understood as embracing. We know, indeed, that it does not include a duty on food or on raw material, and that it excludes the very idea of Colonial Preference; but of the circumstances in which and of the extent to which it is to be applied, we are wholly ignorant. But there is no misunderstanding the nature of Mr. Chamberlain's proposals. He laid them squarely before the country immediately after leaving the Government; he has several times restated them, and they are to be accepted, if not as final in themselves, at least as a foreshadowing of what his final plan will be. He proposed to place a two-shilling duty per quarter on foreign corn, but to let Colonial corn in free; a five-per-cent. duty on foreign meat and dairy produce, from which also Colonial exporters would be exempt; a duty on flour heavy enough to reestablish the British miller; a reduction in favor of the Colonies on the duties on fruits and wines; and an all-round ten-per-cent. duty on foreign manufactured goods. The increase in the cost of living thus produced he proposed to offset by reducing the tax on tea by three-fourths, and on sugar, coffee and cocoa by a half.

Between these two policies there is on paper and in economic theory a clear distinction. The one, though it abandons the basic principles of Free Trade, only does so on the colorable pretext of obtaining Freer Trade; the other is downright Protection, complicated and to an extent alleviated by Colonial Preference. But, politically, the difference between the policies is not so marked. For one thing, Mr. Chamberlain has proved himself by far the stronger personality. He has labored unintermittently for his policy. The result is that the Chamberlain programme has swamped the Balfour programme, and that hardly anybody now believes in the reality of the latter as an issue standing by itself. For another thing, Mr. Balfour has publicly applauded the Chamberlain policy; if he thought it politically advisable, it is probable that he would himself advocate it. He has done everything to en-

courage the Protectionists and everything to discourage the Free-Traders in his own party. He appointed Mr. Austen Chamberlain, an out-and-out Protectionist, to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer; he has allowed his colleagues in the Cabinet to take office in the reconstituted Liberal-Unionist Association, which is now nothing but a branch of the Tariff Reform League; he has watched without protest the hounding of Free Trade Unionists from their constituencies; and he has lent his personal and official support to avowedly Protectionist candidates. From all this the country at large has inferred, not without a certain disgust, that Mr. Balfour is a Protectionist at heart, but dare not say so; and that when the proper time comes, he will merge his own policy of Retaliation into the bolder one of Protection and Colonial Preference. Meanwhile, his half-way house has served as an adroit and useful refuge for the doubters and fence-sitters. So far only thirty Free Trade Unionists have broken away from him and voted against him. There are other Free-Traders in the party, and in the Cabinet itself, who are still able to persuade themselves that Mr. Balfour's policy of Retaliation is an effective barrier against the party's complete reversion to Protection; who look upon him rather as a subtle opponent than as an ally of Mr. Chamberlain; and who expect him eventually to land on the Free Trade side of the fence. On the other hand, those who subscribe to the Chamberlain policy outnumber the Free Trade and the Retaliation Unionists put together. For the past year, therefore, Mr. Balfour, with infinite dexterity, has been obliged to do nothing that would alienate either section of his party. He has completely succeeded; his party still stands chipped, indeed, but not broken; his majority is still secure. The consummate ingenuity with which Mr. Balfour has avoided every trap and every peril, baffled all inquiries, "cornered" the Opposition and wrapped friend and foe alike in a mist of brilliant and bewildering sophistries, constitutes a Parliamentary performance of the highest order. But it is not a performance of the kind that attracts the people. To them it seems shifty, disingenuous and feeble. The British electorate, like the American, abominates above everything the appearance of vacillation and indecision; and the strong wave of disapproval that has already overwhelmed Mr. Chamberlain's policy owes much of its impetus to Mr. Balfour's "tactics."

BERLIN, *August, 1904.*

THE events of the past month have shown conclusively that "friendship with Russia at any price"—Bismarck's legacy to his country—is still the pith and root of German policy. Political friendships are usually one-sided, but not since 1863, when Bismarck assisted Russia to suppress the Polish rebellion, have Germans been more forcibly reminded of that fact, or more uncomfortably conscious of their obligations to their Eastern neighbor. For, at the very moment when Germany was prostituting the law, in deference to the wishes of the Russian police, Russia was requiting her by seizing her ships. The provocation was certainly great. It was the greater because nobody in Germany had anticipated that Russia would be so ungracious or ungrateful as to molest German shipping. Germans had witnessed the expulsions of Russian students from Germany; they had learned that at Wiesbaden their Emperor had given the Tsar the most binding assurances as to Germany's friendship—thereby enabling Russia to denude her Western frontier of troops; they had read in the newspapers the Emperor's telegram on the death of Admiral Makaroff, that "Russia's mourning was Germany's mourning," as also his Majesty's telegram to his Wyborg regiment; they had heard that Krupp's establishment was working overtime, manufacturing arms and ammunition for the Russian army, and they knew that five great liners had been sold to the Russian Government. They had every right to expect that their own attitude of "benevolent neutrality" would receive, at any rate, polite acknowledgment. Neither the German Government, nor the German people, profess the slightest interest in the maintenance of the Black Sea treaties; and, when the irregular activity of the Russian Volunteer Fleet in the Red Sea began, it was the conviction of the country that German shipping would go unmolested. It was, therefore, but natural that the seizure of the "Prinz Heinrich" should throw Germans into consternation. At the time, undoubtedly, profound indignation did prevail among the general public, who felt that the cup of humiliation was flowing over. For the first time for many years, a number of German newspapers published some very nasty things about Russian honor, rule and behavior, and it was evident that all the ingredients that go to produce an outburst of popular passion were present. That was on July 17th. The following day, Sunday, Count von Bülow

took action, and with a few passes of his magic wand the situation changed. Earnest injunctions were issued to the press to exercise great restraint, and from that moment until the final settlement of the affair the public heard comparatively little about the matter.

Looking back at the incident to-day, we can see it as a whole. It forms an interesting episode in the relations of the two Powers, viewed psychologically or politically. Not only has no diminution of cordiality in Russo-German relations ensued from the incident, but there is evidence that, diplomatically, it has rather improved Germany's position with Russia than otherwise. The "towering friendship"—to use a Bismarckian phrase—of Germany for Russia is now more than ever a fact, and von Bülow has demonstrated that he, too, knows that politics is an "art."

It detracts nothing from Count von Bülow's success if it be pointed out that no more ill-timed moment for gratuitously affronting Germany could possibly have been chosen. On the very day the mail-bags of the "Prinz Heinrich" were seized, M. de Witte was closeted with the Chancellor at Norderney endeavoring to come to an understanding (since effected) about the new Commercial Treaty. And when, a week later, the "Scandia" was brought into Port Said by a Russian prize crew, Germans were awaiting with suppressed emotion the verdict from Königsberg. It is no exaggeration to say that the Russian cruiser's escapade affected both issues in a way highly satisfactory to Germany.

A few days after the seizure of the "Prinz Heinrich" the German Ambassador at St. Petersburg was instructed to make a complaint to the Russian Government, and to point out courteously that, while Germany conditionally recognized the right of search, the confiscation of the mail-bags would have to be regarded as an unfriendly act. This complaint was in no sense whatever a protest, and the question of the status of the Russian ships was carefully avoided. Russia, as usual, immediately promised redress, and pending developments the German semi-official press was instructed to refer to the matter as an "isolated" case. The indignation in England at the seizure of the "Malacca" opportunely diverted public attention, and the affair was being rapidly forgotten, when the second seizure was announced. For a moment, the Government was on the horns of a dilemma. It looked as if a principle might become involved, whereas Germany's main endeavor was to avoid all question of principle. The point at issue

was: Are the Russian captains acting in accordance with orders received from the Government? Very properly, no time was lost. Count von Bülow, the day of the announcement of the seizure of the "Scandia," telegraphed fresh instructions to the German Ambassador at St. Petersburg, who on the day following (Sunday) was able to announce that the Russian Government had already issued orders for the release of the vessel. The order took effect at Port Said that evening. The Chancellor's success was undeniable. On the Monday, the German "well-informed" press dwelt with self-complacency upon the achievements of German diplomacy, the aggressions of the cruisers were ascribed to errors of judgment on the part of the captains, and the world was assured that the relations between the two countries were unimpaired. A few days later, Russia proved her contrition by issuing passes to German ships.

The question arises: How did the Chancellor accomplish this? It was certainly not by means of protests such as once astonished Lord Salisbury on the occasion of the seizures of the "Bundesrath" and other vessels by British war-ships, though there never was a doubt as to the status of the British vessels. And yet Russia's prompt settlement of the affair would seem to suggest that some pressure was exercised. The truth is, pressure was not necessary. Russia had made a mistake; and the moment the situation was understood at St. Petersburg Germany was promised, and granted, full reparation. Nothing as yet has transpired as to the question of indemnities. But this much is certain: Germany found herself in the rare position of being able to dictate terms to Russia. She was able to point out that the status of the Black Sea Volunteer Fleet was of no concern to her, but that if German shipping was molested by that fleet she would be compelled to remember that she had been signatory to the Berlin Treaty. She was able to read Russia a lesson on the subject of gratitude, and to remind her that France was not going to plunge into war with England for the sake of those bottoms, whereas the tacit support of Germany would greatly strengthen Russia's position towards England, if it should really be thought desirable at St. Petersburg to make the whole question of the Dardanelles a fighting issue. Lastly, she was able to toy with the threat of cooperation with England, and to hold out indefinite promises of aid in settling the Eastern question at the conclusion of the war. In a word

Germany's arguments proved, as in the circumstances was inevitable, unanswerable, and Count von Alvensleben had the satisfaction of transmitting to Berlin the assurance that the auxiliary cruisers of the Volunteer Fleet would not again "be utilized for the visitation and seizure of neutral ships in the Red Sea." British ships have been seized since that assurance was given; but there can be no doubt that, in the case of Germany, that assurance will be binding even upon the captains of the Volunteer Fleet.*

Thus Count von Bülow, with scarcely an effort, has achieved an imposing diplomatic success. At home, Germans are very much satisfied with the result, which they attribute to the firm attitude of the German Government. Nor has Russia reason to complain. The anti-Russian invective which broke out spontaneously in portions of the German press has been atoned for by the compliments meted out to the Russian Government on the settlement of the affair by the German semi-official organs.

The incident, too, invites comparison. How strangely different was Germany's attitude towards Great Britain at the beginning of 1900. In the case of Russia, what reserve, what moderation, what national modesty! There have been no Pan-German, Anti-Russian crusades, no savage outbursts in the press, no interpellations in the Reichstag, and no violently worded notes. The Chancellor has not been called upon publicly to denounce Russian methods, and he has taken very good care not to do so. And the whole incident has been put before the public by the "well-informed" press as an "isolated" case of irresponsible aggression.

The whole attitude of Germany towards Russia is well worth noting. It would seem to show that, in all questions of policy in which England and Russia are concerned and Germany has to make her choice between them, she will, invariably and inevitably, side with Russia in opposition to Great Britain.

More interesting to Germans even than the seizure of their ships has been the notorious trial at Königsberg. There, in the old law courts, a scene has been enacted which would be almost grotesque, if it were not for the everlasting stigma it has cast upon the political honor of Germany, and of the Prussian judiciary. Nine months ago, it was announced that a number of

* The sinking of the "Thea" is not a case in point. But here again the passive attitude of Germany is remarkable.

Socialists had been arrested, charged with high treason against Russia by aiding and abetting the circulation of seditious writing, *lèse-majesté* against the Tsar, and belonging to a secret organization of a revolutionary character. As time went on, public curiosity in the case increased, and the Government was called upon to define its position. This it did with great solemnity. The Prussian Minister of Justice, and Herr von Richthofen, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, both gravely announced that a seditious movement had been discovered, and that the offenders were to be brought to justice. Thus supported, judicially and politically, by the highest responsible authorities, the trial opened. The Crown prosecutors appeared with huge bundles of documents, pamphlets, leaflets and letters in the Russian language, and then had to admit that they could not read them; moreover they had not been sorted. The charge sheet filled three hundred octavo pages. It was then discovered that not one of the nine accused knew one word of Russian, and the prosecution was unable to prove at whose house, or in whose possession, this or that particular document had been seized. Days passed in translating and reading the writings. Experts on civilization were called as witnesses, and Professor Reussner deposed on the chaos and anarchy of inner Russia. Thus the unique spectacle was witnessed of a learned professor deliberately called to pronounce sentence, in a German Court of law, on the flagitious rule in Russia. Finally it was discovered that the legal basis for the trial was wanting. It transpired that the Russian Consul had doctored documents and bamboozled the German Government. At the eleventh hour, telegrams were sent to Russia, and to the Wilhelmstrasse, to inquire whether any treaty between Germany and Russia existed, as indicated in the Russian consular report, whereby reciprocity of treatment was guaranteed Germany in the case of a similar trial for high treason in Russia. The German Foreign Office had to reply in the negative. Russia characteristically vouchsafed no answer. On this question the whole case stood and fell. The trial was brought to an abrupt conclusion. The speeches of the defence were masterly pieces of forensic argument, and the son of the founder and late leader of the German Social Democracy, Dr. Liebknecht, inveighed with impassioned eloquence against the Russian police régime. All that had been proved, all that could be proved, was that a little smuggling had been carried on. Result: All the nine

prisoners were acquitted on all the counts relating to Russia, six of them only receiving sentences varying from two to three months' imprisonment for being members of a secret organization.

The ignominy of the fiasco at Königsberg has been keenly felt by Germans. If it is endured so patiently it is because it is known that the trial was undertaken by the Government as a political favor to Russia, to whose will all things in Germany—even the law and national dignity—are subservient.

ST. PETERSBURG, *August, 1904.*

THE war against Japan is eminently unpopular in Russia. It is being waged by a mere section of the Government regardless of the will of the people. The persons who are mainly responsible for bringing it on are neither professional politicians nor even members of the administration. They are mostly outsiders, who, for the time being, enjoyed the implicit confidence of the Tsar, which in spite of the disastrous results of their short-sighted measures they have not yet forfeited. And it is those two cardinal facts—the irresponsible power of the governing *junta* and the determination of its members to suppress the inarticulate but determined opposition of the people—that shape the whole policy of the Empire. Thus Russia's relations with foreign Powers are liable to sudden fluctuations, owing to the hasty action of this exalted personage or that without previous consultation with the Foreign Office; and the intelligent as well as the uneducated classes of the nation are incessantly striving, the former by agitation, the latter chiefly by violence, to free themselves from the fetters which arrest the cultural development of the individual and impede the natural growth of the people.

The same influences are at work ripening Russia's official intercourse with Germany into a degree of friendship which differs little from an alliance. The Grand-Duke Alexander Mikhailovitch has done much to forge the links which bind the two Governments. And his motive is Germany's cooperation, partly given and partly promised, with the Russian Government in its twofold struggle against Japan abroad and Russian malcontents at home. Thus in the matter of the pseudo-cruisers the Kaiser's Government has undertaken to uphold Russia's claim to despatch vessels to any part of the world as merchantmen, then to author-

ize them to act as war-ships and, lastly, to obtain for them immunity from attack by transforming them into trading ships once more. Again, when the war is ended and peace negotiations have begun, Russia is anxious to settle her differences with Japan without reference to outsiders. For "the predominance of Russia on the Pacific" is the aim of the war, as the Tsar has defined it. Now, President Roosevelt once indicated that the policy of the United States has a similar ultimate object in view. Besides, the maritime Powers of the world are unwilling to allow the most promising markets of the future to be closed to them forever. Hence they too may desire to circumscribe the field of negotiations between the two belligerents. And as Russia, or rather the Grand-Dukes who now rule that Empire, are resolved to brook no such interference with their plans, they naturally look out betimes for valuable support, and this is expected from Germany.

Against the people of Russia who are struggling for a living wage against the State, which is now the great employer of labor, for elementary instruction and the right of worshipping God as their conscience dictates, the Kaiser's Government has rendered services which, in the words of the independent German press, are calculated to expose the Fatherland to universal odium. Russian spies, organized and paid by the late Minister von Plehve, received authority to carry on operations there as in their own country. Subjects of the Tsar resident in Prussia, Würtemberg and elsewhere were watched, their houses searched and the names of subscribers to liberal Russian periodicals were ascertained and communicated to the Tsar's police, who arrested and imprisoned them. Wrong Russian translations of harmless pamphlets were made and relied upon by the German police as grounds for seizing consignments of them destined for St. Petersburg and for apprehending the senders. Russians who had broken no law but were obnoxious to their own police, whose clutches they had escaped, were seized in Germany and forced not only to quit the territory, but to cross over into Russia, whence they were deported to the island of Saghalien or immured in fortress dungeons. And, having achieved these things, the Berlin Foreign Office officially requested the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs to confer decorations and orders upon the German police and detectives who had "shadowed," seized and delivered these harmless men.

To those two ties which link the Governments of the Tsar and

the Kaiser may be added a third: mistrust of the United States. Down to a relatively recent date the feeling between the Great Republic and the Tsardom was distinctly amicable. But the resolve of the American people not to assent to the closing of the markets and mineral wealth of the Far East to their commercial and industrial enterprise has transformed friendship into bitter enmity. This sudden change is duly reflected by the gaudy pictures of the war which are sold in myriads to the Muscovite masses. In these specimens of rudest art Russia is depicted as thrashing her enemy, while Uncle Sam almost always figures as the sneaking backer of Japan, eager to rob her of the fruit of her victories, but too niggardly to help defray the cost of winning them. To the middle classes the same conception is made plastic and audible in the summer theatres of St. Petersburg and other large cities. There the pathetic and tragic aspect of life at the front is sketched in a series of brilliant scenes, relieved by the Britisher and the Yankee depicted as cowardly big bullies who egg on little Japan to certain ruin that they may live in luxury. The baneful work begun by pictures and theatres is completed by serious organs of the press, whose very exaggerations will soon render even calumny harmless. Yankees and Britishers are there denounced as villainous marplots, who stick at no crime and even grudge no expense to raise up difficulties to Russia. Thus, strange to say, the American dollar is found circulating among all those peoples who may become troublesome to the Government of the Tsar, and the sources of this flow of gold are the banking accounts of American missionaries and commercial agents, who devote themselves to the hatching of foreign plots and the engineering of insurrections.

If Americans and Englishmen thus strike below the belt, it is only natural that the Japanese should demean themselves as wild savages. Kuroki's soldiers, therefore, are described as spending their time after hard-fought battles in torturing the wounded and mutilating the dead. They are barbarians, the Russian press declares, and should be put beyond the pale of civilization.

Those are some of the means employed to console the people of Russia for their reverses on sea and land, and to awaken enthusiasm for the war. But the masses, indifferent to the fate of Manchuria and Corea, act on the maxim that charity begins at home. Hence the people are deeply interested in the war, but mainly

because they hope that a Russian defeat will end the era of autocracy, in which they descry the source of their monotonous misery. Those among them who observe and reason hold that the governing *junta,* having neglected the intellectual needs and material well-being of the people in order to be ready for war, has failed to discharge even this one task of its own choosing, and has thus reduced its system to an absurdity. It is in those events of the war which bid fair to prove the correctness of this view that the popular interest centres, and not in the fate of the peoples of the Far East. The bulk of the nation grudges the money and the men now being sacrificed for a political white elephant, while the masses of Russians are in want of the very necessaries of life.

Americans cannot grasp the issues of the fateful struggle now going on between the people and the governing few without acquiring some ideas about the way in which the pinch of the administrative shoe is felt. The Russians, it should be premised, have no taste for military glory, no greed of foreign territory. Their rulers, on the other hand, anxious to keep them from brooding over their grievances at home, compel them to furnish the funds needed for the annexation of ever more territory, while what they already possess is left practically unexploited. The Government, therefore, is extremely wealthy, while the bulk of the people are living in hunger and squalor. The Treasury is in receipt of the largest revenue ever known, which it is systematically increasing by leaps and bounds unparalleled in history. Between the years 1891 and 1903, the Imperial receipts were more than doubled, rising from $462,240,243 in the first-named year to $973,137,354 in 1903. This money was spent on ships, armaments and railways which yield little or no returns. The lower classes who supplied the greater part of those enormous sums scarcely benefited by their outlay.

For, during the same period, the peasants ate less bread, lost a large percentage of their horses and horned cattle, and in many places had to discard even cabbage and milk as articles of food, while the rate of State expenditure upon education fell off. Thus, the Government allots only one-half per cent. of its budget for elementary schools for its own people, while expending large sums for the educational establishments of those foreign races whose political sympathies it is anxious to win, such as the Serbs, Poles, Bulgarians and Lithuanians. The total amount allowed by the

State for all educational objects is about 7.7 cents per head of the population, whereas the entire outlay of the Government runs up to $7 98. But this is not all. Education is positively discouraged, and the obstacles thrown by the authorities in the way of opening schools are almost insuperable. Yet the Russian people hunger and thirst after knowledge. But the maxim followed by the Government is that it is easier to govern autocratically an illiterate than a literate people.

In proportion as education has been frowned down, the consumption of *vodka* is being actively fostered by the State, which now monopolizes the sale of alcohol and relies upon it as the most important source of the Imperial revenue. The consumption of alcohol was on the wane when Minister de Witte introduced the State Monopoly. For the ten years previous it had diminished by twenty-five per cent., but it then received a powerful fillip from the State, and has ever since gone on augmenting.

Another of the grievances of the people consists in the fact that they are taxed congruously with a preconceived system which takes no account of their general economic condition, or even of their exceptional needs. Thus the year after the famine of 1892 the Imperial receipts showed no falling off; on the contrary, they exceeded the estimates by 84,000,000 roubles. And yet the destitution of the famine-stricken peasants was such that donations of money and corn, on a large scale, were despatched by foreign philanthropists to Russia. Hand in hand with this taxation goes the forced export of corn, of which more is sold than the peasants can afford to dispense with. And here is the proof: 330 kilograms is the amount of rye distributed by the Government in famine years to keep each individual peasant barely alive. Yet statistics seem to have established the astonishing fact that what remains of the corn after the annual quantity has been sent out of the country amounts only to 240 kilograms per head!

The existence of the average husbandman is a series of hardships which only a fatalist could bear with resignation. An official who has lived among the people as the representative of the Government writes in this strain:

"Even at present, half of the hovels are heated in the 'black manner.' That is to say, in the morning when the fire is lighted the upper part of the hut is wrapped in dense smoke, which escapes through chinks in the walls or through a special aperture, but mostly through the door,

which is kept open for the purpose. Meanwhile, the inmates are sprawling or seated on the floor, in order to breathe as little of the smoke as may be. Through the open door, the air from outside comes in, bringing with it a frost of thirteen degrees below zero. The heating operation over, every opening is closed, and the hovel becomes as hot as a steam bath. And towards morning the water often freezes again. The walls and the couch are coated with a layer of black by the smoke. And it is here that the family of about eight souls lives: the old man with the old woman, the married son, the daughter and the children. Here they eat, here they sleep on straw; here the women bring their children into the world, here they spin and weave; here the boys do their school tasks; here too are a calf, lambs, sometimes sucking-pigs, poultry; here a mephitic odor prevails; a lamp burns without a glass or it is not lighted at all, if there happens to be no money to buy petroleum."

It is against such results of autocracy that the peasantry murmur and the intelligent classes protest. And it is to the suppression of all such manifestations of dissatisfaction that the whole domestic policy of the Government has been tending. A commission was appointed by the State to inquire into the causes of the misery of the peasants, and its members were exhorted to speak their minds freely. One and all, noblemen, landowners, lawyers, schoolmasters, gave it as their opinion that the system of Government must be changed, the peasants allowed to quit the soil at their will, and the industrious inhabitants of the country freed from the obligation of working for their lazy and drunken fellows. But the men who uttered these convictions were visited with swift punishment by M. von Plehve. A medical Congress assembled last January from all the ends of Russia to concert measures for coping with infectious and contagious disease. They, too, having counselled education and reform as the first steps, were speedily dispersed to their homes and punished. A Congress for the encouragement of technical education was convoked at the same time, and their resolution, unanimously passed, amounted to a condemnation of autocracy and a demand for representative Government. Then the omnipotent Minister von Plehve forbade all further Congresses.

M. von Plehve was the incarnation of the autocratic principle. His life-work was to establish absolutism on a firm basis, and to develop it still further. Hence, he gave power to all provincial governors to banish noblemen from their estates without trial or explanation; he persecuted the Jews; he abolished the home rule of the Finns; he approved the coercion inaugurated by Bobrikoff

in Finland; he appointed as Bobrikoff's successor Prince Obolensky, who had had women flogged in the south of Russia; he deprived Armenians of their churches, schools and private endowments; he created a *cabinet noir* in the post-office where private letters are opened and copied; he flooded German, Swiss, French and English cities with spies; he gagged the newspaper press; he banished outspoken journalists to Siberia at a moment's notice, without allowing them to put on warm clothing or borrow a little money; he had a girl of seventeen arrested in the dead of night, sent with detectives to Odessa to be confronted with political prisoners, and, when she was shown to be innocent, she was set free at eleven o'clock at night, a thousand miles from her home, without a cent in her pocket or an acquaintance in the town; he made it known throughout the length and breadth of Russia that no opposition to the Government is or can be legal and that all dissatisfaction, however expressed, is criminal.

The upshot of this policy is the total divorce of the Government from the moderate, patriotic and honest elements of the country. Good advice and trustworthy knowledge of the popular frame of mind are no longer within its reach. Its instruments and agents are selected from a category whose members are chiefly concerned to obtain personal success. And as there is no legal opposition, the ranks of the illegal agitators are recruited by fresh forces who are bent on attaining their end by whatever means may commend themselves as efficacious.

It was to a plot hatched by these desperate men that the ill-fated Minister fell a victim. He was aware that his life was in danger; but he had organized the detective system so thoroughly that he felt easy in his mind.

Five days before his death he received information that a fresh plot against his life would soon be carried out, and he gave orders that every suspected person in the capital should be searched. A highly respectable single lady was thus visited, at half past three o'clock at night, by a superintendent of the police, five assistants, ten policemen and one female detective. The chief officer insisted on entering her room, on the ground that in political matters there is no sex, but she finally obliged him to allow the female detective to be present while she was dressing. Every nook and corner of the three little rooms was scrutinized, the boards of the floor were raised and the fruitless search was

continued from half past three until eleven next morning. But the real conspirators were left in peace, and added another blood-stained page to the gory annals of contemporary Russia.

At present, the condition of the Tsardom borders upon anarchy. There is no Government, but only an inaccessible camarilla, with unlimited power untempered by responsibility. There is no Opposition, but only a nation of inarticulate malcontents and a party of desperate conspirators, followers, as they themselves declare, of Brutus and of Charlotte Corday. The war which was begun by the ruling *junta* in blindness will be carried on by them in self-defence, for a Russian defeat would connote the end of absolutism. Meanwhile the bulk of the people look forward to the victory of Japan as the term of their own sufferings and the inauguration of an era of education, freedom of conscience, peace and material prosperity.

WASHINGTON, *August, 1904.*

THE economical solidarity of civilized peoples in the twentieth century is strikingly exemplified by the effect of the war in the Far East on American interests. It was, of course, foreseen from the outbreak of hostilities that the fate of our commerce with Manchuria would depend on the outcome of the contest. Our exports to the three Chinese provinces which lie northeast of the Great Wall, and to which collectively the name of Manchuria is given, had signally increased during the decade preceding the Boxer troubles. There was no reason to doubt that the development would continue, if the administration of those provinces should revert from Russian to Chinese hands, and the enjoyment of the rights of intercourse conceded to us by treaty should thus be secured. The promise to make of Dalny a free port might be broken, like the promise to evacuate Chinese territory at a specified time, and few Americans were so credulous as to believe that, if Manchuria became Russian, their products would long be suffered to compete with Russian commodities on equal terms in the Manchurian market. It was not to be expected, therefore, that American manufacturers and merchants would be glad to witness a definite triumph of Russia over Japan. They had good reason to desire the contrary result. The Tokio Government has repeatedly announced that, if successful, it would

look to Russia exclusively for the fruits of victory. Besides a formal recognition of her right to control Corea, Japan might properly exact a large pecuniary indemnity for the cost of the war, together with territorial compensation in the shape of the island of Saghalien, the strip of Manchurian seacoast on the southern tip of which stands Vladivostok, and that section of the Liao-tung peninsula which includes Dalny and Port Arthur, and which was leased for twenty-five years to Russia. It may also be taken for granted that Japan would require the surrender of the railway lines which Russia has been allowed to construct from the Siberian frontier to Vladivostok and Port Arthur, but which, after the loss of those ports, she would have no excuse for retaining. Confining himself to these demands, the Mikado, it is understood, would cheerfully acquiesce in the reinstatement of Chinese authority throughout Manchuria, from the right bank of the Amur River to the Bay of Corea. Thenceforth, the privileges granted to us by our treaty of commerce with China would become operative throughout the region which has been the theatre of conflict, with the exception of the small tract on the Liao-tung peninsula which was leased, as we have said, to Russia, but which will have become Japan's by right of conquest.

It was mainly from this point of view that, at the outset, the Far-Eastern contest was regarded in the United States. We wanted to keep and expand our market in Manchuria, and the conviction that this desire was attainable only through Japan's success had more influence on the popular mind than racial antipathy—of which, indeed, there was hardly a trace—or than the traditional friendliness which has long marked the relations of the United States and Russia. As the war has progressed, however, it has become evident that our interests might be materially affected in more points than one. Not only are American citizens, as exporters, and as the owners of a valuable railway concession, directly concerned in the maintenance of China's authority and territorial integrity, but it is for them a matter of moment that the rights of neutrals shall suffer no impairment at the hands of either belligerent. Of course, international law has only been partially codified by the St. Petersburg and Geneva conventions, and by the treaties of Paris and Washington. So far as they go, the rules propounded in those instruments are, no doubt, binding on the parties to the com-

pacts. There remains, however, a wide field wherein it is not always easy to say where international law begins and international morality ends. By the former term is meant the rules of conduct that the nations of the civilized world admit, nay, insist upon. Every addition to them represents a forward step in the path of enlightenment and humanity; or else an adjustment to new conditions and instruments of warfare. Among the questions which the present war has forced into the foreground, and in which the United States are manifestly interested, is whether, owing to the greatly increased range of modern artillery, the three-mile limit—the traditional boundary of territorial waters—is not much too short; and to what extent, under what conditions and at what distance from the actual theatre of military or naval operations wireless telegraphy may be used by neutrals. Should, for instance, a war correspondent, himself the subject or citizen of a neutral State, have the right to secure, by means of a balloon, sent up from a neutral vessel far outside the three-mile limit, information regarding the internal condition of a beleaguered fort, and communicate it by wireless telegraphy to his newspaper, which would publish it to the world, and, inferentially, to the blockaders? Then, again, what are the rights and correlative duties of neutrals as regards the hospitality that may be offered to the war-vessels of a belligerent? That was a question of great moment to us during our Civil War, and it has been again brought home to us by the seizure of the "Retshitelny" in the harbor of Chefoo.

The Russians assert that, by capturing the destroyer in neutral waters, Japan committed a breach of international law, and that China, through its representative at Chefoo, connived at the act. China, on her part, denies connivance, and has demanded from Japan reparation for the alleged violation of her neutrality; while the Japanese have thus far persisted in retaining the vessel, asserting that provocation for the seizure was given by the Russians. Evidently, a case is presented for The Hague Tribunal, or for an arbitrator to be agreed upon by the parties in interest. At the hour when we write, Secretary Hay, with his usual discretion, has forborne to assume the truth of the Russian, the Japanese or the Chinese version of the facts, and, consequently, has refrained from addressing any protest on the subject to any of the chief Powers implicated in the transaction.

Count Cassini, the Russian Ambassador at Washington, would have had our Government take for granted the correctness of the Russian account, and apply a species of moral coercion to Japan and China for the purpose of procuring the return of the captured vessel and the payment of an indemnity. Even if Count Cassini's report of the facts were known to be well founded, it would not follow that the United States, merely because they had suggested the desirability of respecting China's neutrality, had bound themselves to enforce the performance by China of a neutral's duty, and to assure to her the enjoyment of a neutral's rights. At the time when the subject of China's neutrality was first brought by Secretary Hay to the attention of the Powers concerned, he was asked what course he would pursue in the event of China's neutrality being violated by herself or by one of the belligerents. Mr. Hay replied, in effect, that he would cross that bridge when he came to it. He has come to the bridge now, and, apparently, his method of crossing it is to declare that, while he views the Chefoo incident with regret, he denies that any obligation to require reparation rests upon our State Department. But we must recognize the importance to ourselves of a reference of the affair to an international tribunal, in view of the likelihood, not to say certainty, that, in some future contest, the war-vessels of a belligerent may seek refuge in our Atlantic, Pacific or insular ports, or propose to traverse our Panama Canal. What Americans hope is that their State Department will, by friendly representations, prevail upon the Governments of Tokio, St. Petersburg and Peking to submit the conflicting testimony and the questions raised thereby to The Hague international court. The three new rules which the Treaty of Washington (1871) directed the Geneva Board of Arbitration to apply to the "Alabama" case, rules to which England reluctantly assented, were that a neutral government is bound, first, to use "due diligence" to prevent the fitting out, arming or equipping within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or to carry on war against a Power with which it (the neutral government) is at peace, and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been adapted, in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction to warlike use; secondly,

not to permit either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms or the recruitment of men; and, thirdly, to exercise due diligence in its own ports or waters, as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligations and duties. If China, as Russia asserts, has violated these principles, we ought, no doubt, to urge compliance with them by diplomatic representations at Peking. The phrase "due diligence" was undoubtedly vague, but it was defined at Geneva to mean that the diligence ought to be proportioned to the belligerent's risk of suffering from any failure of the neutral to fulfil his obligations. It is plain enough that Japanese commerce might be seriously imperilled, if the Russian cruiser at Shanghai were permitted to leave that port with a full supply of coal. Admitting that she could not be expected to return to Port Arthur, which, if it were not already in Japanese hands, would be closely invested, we must recognize that the supply of the combustible conceded to her should be strictly limited to the amount needed to carry her to Vladivostok. It is also pertinent to recall another important principle which the United States established beyond dispute in the "Alabama" controversy. Whatever the obligations of a neutral in any given case may be, failure to fulfil them is not excused, either by defects of the municipal law or by successful evasions of that law. A neutral State ought to make its laws conformable to its international duties, and to compel its subjects, or those of a belligerent, to obey them. If it fails in either respect, and injury to a belligerent is the consequence, a neutral State is answerable to the injured party under the law of nations.

Of incomparably more importance to the United States than any other question raised incidentally during the Far-Eastern War is Russia's assertion of a right to transfer food from the category of articles *conditionally* contraband to the list of those *absolutely* contraband. If the St. Petersburg Government had wished to demonstrate the existence of a vital community of interest between the United States and Great Britain, it could not have hit upon a more effective expedient to that end. By confiscating American flour consigned, not to the Japanese Government, nor to a blockaded Japanese port, nor to a Japanese military or naval force, but to private persons in Japan, Russia

violated a principle the maintenance of which in international law has come to be indispensable to Great Britain, as the largest importer, and to the United States, as the largest exporter, of food products. The position of England with regard to such commodities has changed within a century. In 1783, she made large seizures of provisions destined for the French Republic, on the plea that there was a chance of reducing France by famine. The United States at that time protested against the notion that provisions, not consigned to a blockaded port, could in any circumstances be contraband—a position more advanced than that taken in the modern American doctrine that an actual *military* destination, even of luxuries, will impress upon the cargo a contraband character.

Among modern jurists, Ortolan excused provisions under all circumstances from the class of contraband goods. Now, apparently, our State Department means to hold in the "Arabia" case that there must be *prima facie* proof of the military destination in order to justify the treatment of provisions as contraband. We are informed that the British Foreign Office has made an identical declaration. It is certain that, if England were engaged in war with a Continental coalition, her opponents would desire to treat food as contraband, and they would be certain to recall the plea, which, as we have said, was put forward by a British Ministry, that it was lawful to employ the weapon of famine against a hostile people. If England had permitted Russia's seizure of the American flour consigned to Japanese merchants on the steamship "Arabia" to pass without remonstrance, she would have acquiesced in the establishment of a precedent which might have spelled for her catastrophe. Our State Department would have shown itself equally short-sighted, had it failed to protest with promptness and firmness against the doctrine propounded at St. Petersburg; for, otherwise, in the event of England's becoming involved in a contest with two or more Continental Powers, and losing temporarily command of the sea, we might have been cut off from the largest consumer of our food products. The discussion of the "Arabia" affair has revealed to Americans and Englishmen the identity of their national interests in a vital particular. There is no doubt that the two peoples have been brought closer together by this incident of the Far-Eastern war.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXV.

OCTOBER, 1904.

CZARISM AT BAY.

BY KARL BLIND.

I.

As the forces of Czardom are driven back and crippled more and more, both on sea and on land, curious attempts are being made in England to impress public opinion with the idea that, if ever she were actively to turn against Russia, she would have to reckon with an armed alliance between Russia and Germany. An Australian writer writes in a Liberal London paper, after having travelled through the Muscovite Empire:

"I saw quite enough to make me know that the Czar of Russia is at this present moment holding in a grip of iron the war party in St. Petersburg, who, rightly or wrongly, imagine that Britain's present Government intrigued successfully with the powers at Tokio to bring about the present war between Russia and Japan. It is the Czar who stands between the war party and their desires, and prevents such a conflagration as the world has not seen in our time. I wish I could burn this into the brain of every Briton who loves his country and hopes for its welfare: 'If war comes, Russia will not stand alone.' A nation with a fine fleet and a terrible army, an army that is ready to the last button on the last shirt, will stand with her, fall with her, too, perhaps, for in the end we have always had a trick of holding our own; but think of the terrible sacrifice which must be made if things come to such a

Copyright, 1904, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved.

pass, all danger of which could easily be obviated now by the exercise of a little wise statecraft, or, better still, a little national common sense."

After that, the writer, whose imagination is on a par with, or rather exceeds even, his graphic qualities of style, fully explains that it is Germany who would, in the case mentioned, come to the rescue of Russia! He then strenuously pleads for a brotherly feeling between the Englishman and the Muscovite. He says he has been through Siberia and heard of its richness in mineral ore "that made me green with envy." He "saw forests waiting for the woodman's axe, and plains waiting for the plough. If we could only get rid of the insane prejudice that parts the two peoples, what an opening is there for the British merchant and the British mechanic!"

"And after all," he continues, "who is it that gains by the prejudice that stands like a rampart between us and them (the Russians)? Only the favored classes of each people, not the bone and brain of either nation. What business has this generation of Britons to cherish hate of Russia; what cause have we to dislike them? The Russian worships the same God that we worship; he adores the same Christ. . . . Believe me, the Muscovite is worth cultivating as a friend; *he is worth dreading as a foe.*"

Thus, by alternately threatening England with a Russo-German alliance, and using words of fraternal cajolery, an endeavor is made to smooth matters for Muscovite autocracy, so far as England is concerned. But what right has any one to assert that it is only "the favored classes" in England who are opposed to the despotic system of government in the vast Empire of the Czar? Is not, on the contrary, the strongest feeling in that matter to be found among the truly Liberal, Radical and Democratic masses—even as was the case, to my full personal remembrance, in the days before and during the Crimean war? At that time, too, Liberals, Republicans and Socialists all over Europe, headed in England by exiled leaders like Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin, Kossuth, and by German and Polish exiles, myself among them, called out for the most efficient warfare against that arch-despot, Nicholas I., whose rule had weighed like an incubus on the Continent at large.

The Muscovite is worth cultivating as a friend, says Mr. Hales. But whom does he mean by the word "Muscovite?" There are tools of the autocrat's tyranny of really Russian origin, and there

are such tools also among unscrupulous and corrupt men of different race. On the other hand, there are numbers of real Russians who aim, more or less hopefully, or with reckless self-sacrifice, at the introduction of representative institutions. Now, with which class of Muscovites should Englishmen suddenly swear eternal friendship?

Again, are there not ever so many down-trodden, non-Muscovite races in the Czar's Empire, who are rattling at the bars of the great prison-house? What about the Finns, the Poles, the Letts, the German urban populations of the Baltic provinces, the Armenians?—to mention but some of them. In the introductory words of a previous article in this REVIEW, I mentioned that the very first successes of the Japanese on sea were jubilantly celebrated, as far away as the United States, by Polish emigrants. Since then, the Polish youth in Cracow have issued a declaration at a meeting, to this effect:

"Seeing that the most effective crippling of Russia is in the interest of Poland, and will facilitate the reconstruction of our fatherland, the Polish youth sympathize in the heartiest manner with the Japanese, and congratulate them upon the successes hitherto gained, whereby the power and the reputation of Russia have been greatly shaken. In view of the forthcoming mobilization in Russian Poland, we hold it to be the correct way of acting for Polish soldiers and reservists not to desert before the mobilization, but to do so later on, on the theatre of war, as this would be the best means of damaging the Czar's army, both numerically and morally."

Now, are Englishmen to give up their sympathies with the cause of the Polish and other nationalities, for the sake of currying favor with the Bobrikoff-Plehve system of government, which is to be continued in spite of the awful warnings recently addressed to a relentless autocracy?

In Finland, Prince Obolenski has been appointed, and he is noted for his atrocious acts against a dissatisfied peasantry. He is a kind of Muscovite Haynau. In Russia proper, the same inhuman harshness of rule goes on. It is upheld—as a Russian high official in the "Quarterly Review" has stated—by Nicholas II., who seems to be a self-willed and yet easily influenced monarch, combining, as is not seldom the case, the characteristics of a weakling with those of a pretender to personal domination in the "*L'Etat c'est moi*" style. He once said to a deputation that his

ambition was to follow in the footsteps of Nicholas I. What worse prospect could he have held out to his subjects?

Mr. Hales does not appear to have reflected upon all this. Having been talked over in Russia, he trots out a bogey to Englishmen of a coming Russo-German alliance, by which evidently they are to be hypnotized into friendliness with the "Muscovite." But Germany does not mean to shed her blood for the sake of the "beautiful eyes" of Nicholas II. In whatever personal utterances the German Emperor may indulge, his Government will maintain an attitude of neutrality. It will not dream of throwing the German nation in arms into this war at the side of that Russian tyranny the doings of which have been exposed at the recent State Trial at Königsberg, in such a manner as to give rise to an outcry of indignation even among journals which are in contact with semi-official sources at Berlin.

To give an idea of the Australian writer's odd means of impressing his readers, I may quote from a concluding paragraph of his, in which he says that Russia is only now making her preparations for war. He says:

"Try and picture such a scene as this, and it is a scene I have looked at so often that I grew sick of gazing. A train running at fourteen miles an hour. . . . What do you see? A vast stretch of fast-ripening rye, the stuff out of which the Russian soldier's bread is made. . . . Far as the eye can reach, you will see rye, nothing but rye. It is almost under your nose, and it reaches to the bounds of your horizon. Now, leave your window and cross over, and look out of the other side. And what do you see? Rye, nothing but rye. . . . The train is like a giant worm crawling in a prairie. You are in the midst of *the Russian army's preparations for the war.* That, for Russia, at least, has only just commenced. You cannot realize it, my friend. You have been used to hearing of grain talked about by the paltry million bushels, perhaps. When it comes to square miles that make you giddy in the counting, you turn away and marvel. Well, so do I, and so will a lot of other folk before we are three years older."

It is pertinent to ask: "Did not these enormous rye-fields exist before the war?"

II.

From this terrifying description of the boundless corn-fields, let us turn to another picture.

At the Königsberg State Trial, which practically ended in the disgrace of the disclosure of the attempted subserviency to the

Czar, a witness was called by the defence, whose revelations as to the condition of Russia made the deepest impression abroad. This was Professor von Reussner, a Russian subject, a member of the Orthodox Church, who for five years had been a Professor of Public Law and Criminal Jurisprudence at Tomsk. He resigned after the late student disturbances in that university-town, when several undergraduates were beaten and flogged by the police. For it is always "flogging, nothing but flogging" in Russia, to use the style of the Australian writer—even for political malcontents and prisoners. The very Senate of Tomsk sent a protest to the Minister of Public Instruction, but in vain. It was then that Professor von Reussner handed in his resignation.

In his long cross-examination, the full report of which is before me, and which extends over many columns, he said:

"The influence of the Czar has certain limits. The power of the officials is unlimited. There is no criminal responsibility for them, unless the higher authorities give permission for a prosecution. Even then, the Court for judging an official is mainly composed of officials of the Administration itself. There exists in Russia no right of religious creed. It is forbidden to secede from the Orthodox Church. Even the change from one sect to another is only allowed by special permission of the Home Secretary. A conversion to one of the German Protestant sects entails the loss of all rights and transportation to Siberia. To leave the Græco-Catholic Church entails also the loss of the right to educate one's children. The clerical authorities can imprison any suspect for life in a cloister; for, by the side of the administrative procedure of transportation, there is a similar privilege of the Church to exile people to Siberia."

In regard to the press, Professor Reussner stated that the Home Secretary can at any time prohibit the sale of a paper, or forbid it to discuss certain questions. Various Ministers and the Procurator of the Holy Synod can suppress a journal at any moment. There is a Church censorship, a Military censorship, a censorship for Public Libraries, and a special censorship for Popular Libraries. Any meeting whatsoever can be prohibited by the police. Even judicial sentences can be altered by administrative action. Thus, one sentenced to transportation to Siberia may be imprisoned for life in the dread dungeon of Schlüsselburg.

During the recent riots which arose out of political discontent, floggings took place on a large scale. It was at first believed, the Russian expert witness said, that this was an exceptionally arbitrary measure; but it was found afterwards that it was based on a

secret ordinance of Alexander III. Those condemned for political offences, men and women, have often been flogged. Hunger strikes, on the part of such prisoners, frequently occurred by way of protest. Students have, as a punishment, been put into the army for life, irrespective of their being sick or cripples. Emigration without permission entails confiscation of property.

A right of petition Professor Reussner further explained does not exist in Russia. The change in the Constitution of Finland, without the assent of the Diet, was a State-stroke, an open violation of the Constitution by the Czar. The documents published by R. Leonoff, as well as more recent publications of a similar kind, in which the complicity of the "Asiatic Department" of Russia with bomb outrages in Bulgaria, and with the terrible tragedy at Belgrade, is fully evidenced, have the usual official form.

"When two students," the Russian witness said in conclusion, "had been flogged by the police at Tomsk, I went to Petersburg, but could not obtain justice from the Minister. The judicial inquiry was conducted by the Commander of the Gendarmerie, Wahl. Thereupon I resigned my position."

Wahl, one of the cruellest men, has taken a malicious pleasure in sneering at political prisoners placed before him, by saying that he had "something very special for their benefit"—meaning, as it turned out, their subjection to the knout.

III.

Can it be wondered at, in such a state of affairs, that the "mild justice" of revenge should have its course among the victims of so unbearable a tyranny? Perfectly trustworthy news, both from Helsingfors and from Petersburg—some of which has come to me privately—fully bears out the significant fact that the deeds done against Bobrikoff and Plehve correspond to the national, patriotic feeling of the Finns, and to the rising indignation of the cultured classes in Russia, in an unexpectedly strong manner.

I have before me a letter, signed "G. Georgi (St. Petersburg)," in which the writer says:

"There exists an indescribable fermentation. Schaumann has become the hero of the Finnish people. *He is recognized as its William Tell.* In all circles, even where political assassination is, on principle, strictly condemned, men speak with satisfaction of this deed, and mention Schaumann with deep respect. He is looked upon as the avenger of so

much wrong and suffering brought by Bobrikoff over Finland. Even though Bobrikoff was not directly held responsible for the prevailing 'policy of the knout,' he was hated as the ready tool of Plehve and Pobiedonostseff. He was loathed as the destroyer of the happiness of hundreds of families, as the organizer of treachery and falsehood by a system of espionage, which has sadly undermined social intercourse—once so pleasant, and rightly famed in Finland for its hospitality and its noble freedom. He had driven out from office the incorruptible officials of the country, and replaced them by mean self-seekers. The Police Administration had been filled by him with individuals of the shadiest kind, who had lost positions elsewhere. In the Postal Administration a 'Black Cabinet' had been established by him. These are some of the traits of the new Russified Finland. And because Bobrikoff had set aside all regard for morality, for law, and for public faith, therefore the Czar, forsooth, assisted in carrying his coffin on his own shoulders!"

This is surely a strong description from the pen of a man who, writing from the Russian capital, even risks giving his name, though at any moment he might be haled as a prisoner to the fortress of Schlüsselburg, or as an exile to Siberia. Those who have had experience of the time shortly before the outbreak of some revolution will understand the significance of such boldness. There are then generally a few men who thus act as brave and often self-sacrificing forerunners of a coming popular upheaval.

So much for public feeling in Finland. Again, the killing of Plehve is now spoken of at Petersburg, among the so-called "Intelligence"—that is, the educated class which holds Liberal principles—in terms of that peculiar kind in which there is a curious combination, much relished among cultured Russians, of strong political sentiment and of humorously ironical expressions. A man like the one who took the life of Plehve is called "a highly respectable assassin," a "most laudable murderer," and so forth. It is stated that "such words are now to be heard all over Petersburg in good society."

Among the lowest class, it is true, in which crass ignorance and bigotry prevail, the tone may be different; but there can be no doubt as to the tendency among all the better educated. Their ardent wish is to see representative institutions at last introduced. With an angry indignation that knows no bounds, they point to the fact of the so-called despicable yellow race in Japan enjoying a Constitution, whilst they themselves are the enslaved subjects of an Autocrat who cultivates the most antiquated superstitions, and of his tools, who, on their part, flatter his ambi-

tion and his prejudices, and mislead him often by false representations.

The dissatisfaction of the cultured and liberal-minded classes may be measured from several recent articles of Prince Meschtscherski in the "Grashdanin." That gentleman is by no means in favor of the introduction of a Parliament. He is, on the contrary, of quite a conservative, not to say reactionist type, as he might be described in other countries. He is an upholder of the power of the Czar and looked upon as a friend at Court.

He writes that, at the assassination of Plehve, he was "surprised by the equanimity with which society received the news of the event. "Equanimity" is a mild word for what is known to be the real attitude of society at Petersburg. "It made," he says, "the impression of enervation or of demoralization." By that latter word he means the virtual sympathy with the deed of the man who killed Plehve. However, Prince Meschtscherski would fain not believe that such was the case; but he adds: "At the moment that violent deed was done, there was a paralyzing feeling, created by the anxious question: 'What will come now?' I myself was thus affected."

He describes himself as a Conservative. But he condemns the daily conflicts between Government and the elements of dissatisfaction, the treatment of the "Zemstvos" (provincial Diets), and the action of the police—which he looks upon as being contrary to the Imperial promises made in the Czar's Manifesto of February 26, 1903. That manifesto spoke of an "approachment of the People to the Throne." He mentions his own repeated conversations with Plehve, in which, whilst objecting himself to the introduction of a Parliament, he (Prince Meschtscherski) pleaded for decentralization and local self-government. Plehve would not hear of even that. "So the omnipotence of the Imperial Administration," Meschtscherski writes, "was fully established, and all social forces were subjected to Plehve *as to a despot.*"

This was written, after the life of the despot had been taken, by a conservative member of the high aristocracy. He has also to say something about the necessity of showing tolerance to adherents of religious sects and better treatment of non-Muscovite nationalities. By oppressing them, he asserts, they are driven into forming a united mass of enemies to Russian nationality. From such combination Russian nationality, the Prince says, suffers

even in an economic sense; for instance—as he alleges—in the Caucasus, and in what he, too, calls, in the usual official language, the "Western Territory," meaning Poland.

It is easy to imagine the views and the sentiments of the really Liberal class when a man like Prince Meschtscherski feels compelled to speak out in this way.

Here it may be useful to correct the frequently expressed erroneous idea that Russian revolutionists are simply "Nihilists." There was once a small section of men whom utter despair had made to adopt an insane gospel of general destruction without plan or purpose of the establishment of a new, better ordered state of society. But among the elements of dissatisfaction in Russia, Nihilism is utterly exploded now. There are, among them, as elsewhere, moderate Liberals whose aims do not go further than the introduction of a Parliament as a means of gradual progress; Republicans of the type of Social Reformers; and Socialists proper. In the native groups of the latter there are two sections: those who think that, before all, terror has to be struck into Government by all kinds of means; and others who would rather forego using such measures, in which the bomb, the revolver, and the dagger play their part. It is always so, shortly before a coming revolution. France, Italy, Germany, England also in olden times, have had experience of the same.

As M. Plehve has been denounced as a despot by Prince Meschtscherski, an infernal plan has to be mentioned, proposed in a pamphlet which appeared under Russian censorship; that is, practically with the permission of the late Minister of the Interior. It bore the title, "China or We," and was distributed largely among the wealthier Russian peasants and among traders in the towns. It proposed the conquest of northern China by Russia, and the transportation of 20,000,000 of the people of northern China to Central Asia, where they were to be distributed as slaves among the agricultural and manufacturing class! Military settlements were to be established in northern China; and all Russian vagabonds, workless men, and politically dangerous persons were to be transported there.

On the face of it, these proposals may be held to be too absurd for discussion. The strange thing is, that the *imprimatur* should have been given to such a pamphlet. It looks like an attempt to attach certain classes of the people to the policy of Government.

IV.

All history teaches that when things are nearly ripe for a revolutionary outbreak among a despotically oppressed nation, the ideas of tyrannicide get hold of the most moderate men, and, with the lessons of history before him, Nicholas II. had better reflect whether it is prudent to cling to the autocratic system at a time when even Japan enjoys representative government and "Young Turks" call for the re-convocation of an Ottoman Parliament, which had existed in 1877-78, and which was only "prorogued" by the Sultan under the pressure of Russian bayonets. Nicholas I. had to wade to the throne through blood. Nicholas II., by not yielding in time to the wishes of the enlightened classes, really draws upon himself an enormous personal responsibility.

Unfortunately, the man who professed to set up a Temple of Peace, and who at the same time ordered an increase of military and naval forces; who furthermore broke his oath to the Finns, and provoked a war in the Far East, appears to be past teaching. He obstinately continues the old system, which is one of corruption at home, and now also of inefficiency in war. Whilst his regular navy is crippled, he audaciously allows his so-called Volunteer Fleet—practically a piratical force—to insult the strongest naval power of the world by capturing and sinking commercial vessels of that nation, as well as of others. It is a strange presumption upon the longanimity of neutrals. In former days, such pirates would have at once been sought out by the insulted Power, been captured or sunk, and their captains, according to maritime law, strung up at the masthead without further ado.

Everything that could be done to wear out the patience of, or unpleasantly to startle, his own subjects, Nicholas II. foolishly does even in minor matters. "What is the meaning," people ask, "of his giving the name of Alexis to his new-born boy?"

Alexis was the name of the son whom Peter I. killed! Alexis was also the name of that loose-living Czar, under whom the Russian nation was deprived of the last few constitutional rights which had been gained at the election of the first ruler of the House of Romanoff. In those olden days, the formula for newly enacted laws was: "The Czar has ordered, and the boyars [noblemen, forming a kind of Chamber] have given their assent." Later on, under Alexis, even this slight constitutional privilege was abolished.

These are the Alexis names known in history, which Nicholas II. now revives for his presumptive heir. A curious predilection, indeed!

V.

The braggart utterances of the press under the Czar's influence are now a frequent theme of contemptuous remarks among the better educated Russians, though everything is done by Government not to let the truth be fully known as to the events in the Far East. Quite recently, shortly before the destruction of the "Rurik," one of those papers which support the aggressive policy of Government, boastfully wrote:

"We shall concentrate ourselves. We shall gather our forces on sea and on land, in order to measure ourselves with the enemy in a decisive battle. Our fleet is intact; and now, after six months, it is perhaps even more threatening for Japan and her navy, which, by its losses, and by its having had to remain, for half a year, in preparation for war, is very much weakened. Port Arthur is still in our hands, and the many sacrifices and persistent attempts of the Japanese to take it from us are, and will be, in vain. . . . The end will crown the work."

This is the kind of information one of the most frequently quoted Petersburg journals, the "Novoe Vremya," vouchsafes to its readers. However, slowly but surely, the real truth gradually penetrates even among the masses in Russia. They have been told that the reverses the army has suffered were the result of a clever Russian plan to draw the enemy into the interior, where he would be overwhelmed. But the most benighted peasant will, when Port Arthur falls, refuse to be convinced that this, too, was a part of so clever a scheme.

Meanwhile, discontent is on the increase all through Russia. The different races may have a difficulty in combining for action; but everywhere there are signs of growing opposition. Outside, also, there are some manifestations of no mean importance.

It may be remembered that, in the Norwegian struggle for greater independence from Sweden, Björnstjerne Björnson, the distinguished poet, had gone very far in approaching Russia. As he is a republican in principle, this created naturally much astonishment. It was a very unwise act of his. He thought—so he once wrote—that Russia was no danger to the Scandinavian countries, her whole bent lying towards conquest in the East. He forgot that Russia has always alternated between conquest in the

Near and Far East and conquest in the North and West of Europe.

At last, however, the Norwegian poet has been taught the right view by what occurred in Finland. The Russification operated there was evidently to be used as a stepping-stone for a later aggression upon Scandinavia; and finally, I may add, as a means of obtaining an ice-free harbor in the Northern Sea, opposite the Scottish shore. A scheme for the acquisition of such a harbor—namely, Hammerfest—is traceable as far back as the time before the Crimean war; which I perfectly remember.

Were Nicholas II. in reality that which misguided flatterers have described him to be, on account of his peace-loving propositions at The Hague—propositions he himself utterly disregards!—he would have plenty of good work to do in his own dominions. There can be no doubt that the achievements of the Japanese are attributable to their remarkable advance in scientific accomplishments, besides their personal bravery, as well as to the high standard of intellectual culture among the people at large. Japan has a population of only 45,000,000; the Russian Empire more than 140,000,000. But in Japan 4,302,623 children attend school; in the vast dominions of the Czar only 4,193,594. It need not be said that the difference is still greater as regards the higher educational establishments in Japan, as compared with Russia.

What a field for bettering the state of popular instruction in the Empire of the young man who posed as a friend of peace and progress! But as a matter of fact, the rule of brute force goes on under him with unabated cruelty.

Not a few educated Russians, therefore, incline to the idea that it would be a good thing for their nation if the armed forces of Autocracy were thoroughly beaten. The defeat of Nicholas I. in the Crimean war brought to Russia at least some degree of relaxation from his iron rule in matters of the public press and of the provincial Assemblies. Finally, too, the serfdom of the peasantry had to be abolished in consequence of that war.

At the recent International Congress in Amsterdam, the strongest imaginable demonstration was made by a Russian representative. Among the delegates present there was a Japanese, Katajama: of Russians there appeared Plechanoff, who has incisively written against the Anarchist theory, which is often erroneously mixed up with the Socialist doctrine; Leo Deutsch, who recently

was in great danger of being unjustly delivered over to the Russian authorities, but was saved in the nick of time; and Vera Sassulitsch. She is well known for having made an attempt, in the eighties, upon the life of a Chief of the Police, who had had political prisoners, among them one of her own intimate acquaintance, brutally flogged and otherwise subjected to great cruelties. Juries being in existence at that time for such cases—they have since been abolished—Vera Sassulitsch was, to the horror of government, declared "not guilty," and managed, with the help of friends, to escape across the frontier of the Russian Empire.

When Katajama, the Japanese, and Plechanoff, the Russian, shook hands at the Congress, there was tremendous applause. After a speech of the former, Plechanoff followed; both having previously been elected Vice-Presidents. In a long and passionate speech, Plechanoff maintained that "the Russian people had had nothing to do with conjuring up this nefarious war, but that the hostile conflict had been provoked by the mortal enemy of the Russian people—namely, by the despotic Czar. If the Government of Petersburg were to be victorious, it would not be Japan, but the Russian people, which would really be the vanquished."

The speaker continued by saying that the autocratic Czars, by their acts of oppression, had enslaved a mass of nations all around the boundaries of the Empire, thereby earning universal hatred. These nations were sorely suffering from the same chains which bound the Russian people. Hence Russian freedom had a thorough feeling of solidarity with those down-trodden races. What had been done in Finland was, Plechanoff said, on a par with what had long been done in Russia. "Now, however," he declared, "the time has come at last for the end of the Czar's tyranny. Blow after blow, defeat after defeat, administered to his forces in this war, evoke in Russia no sympathy with Government. That sorely driven Autocracy is a Colossus with feet of clay, and Japan is fortunately on the point of smashing one of these feet. The other will have to be crushed at home." In conclusion, Plechanoff spoke with indignation against France, who "had become the strongest support of the Czar's despotism, by paying with her gold the Executioner of All the Russias."

There was the liveliest applause for these bitter and incisive remarks. Let Nicholas II. reflect upon them.

KARL BLIND.

CONDITIONS IN THE CONGO FREE STATE.

BY BARON MONCHEUR, ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY FROM BELGIUM TO THE UNITED STATES.

SOME thirty years ago, the world knew nothing about the Congo and cared even less; but, since that time, much has happened in Central Africa. Stanley has explored the country, and the Belgians, led by King Leopold, have developed it. Thirty years ago, the Congo was given over to barbarism, cannibalism, intertribal wars and the horrors of the Arab slave raids, in which 100,000 victims were killed or captured every year. To-day it is a flourishing kingdom, governed by an enlightened ruler, who has not only developed the country commercially, but who has absolutely destroyed the slave raids, who has introduced Christianity and civilization, and who has put forth every effort to improve the condition of the natives and to fulfil the motto of the State, which is "Work and Progress."

The most impartial commentary on the administration of the Congo is to be found in a comparison of the condition of the country to-day with the state of affairs existing there a quarter of a century ago. The work must be judged by its results. The tree must be known by its fruit.

This tree which has flourished so excellently in Africa, and which has brought forth such good fruit both in a commercial and in a humanitarian sense, was planted by King Leopold. Even before he came to the throne of Belgium, he realized that his densely crowded country must find an outlet for its energies in lands beyond the seas, and his keen perception singled out Central Africa as a field in which his countrymen could develop their commerce, and at the same time carry civilization to a benighted people.

"I will pierce the darkness of barbarism," he declared in the

Belgian Senate; "I will secure to Central Africa the blessing of a civilized government; and I will, if necessary, undertake this giant work alone." In pursuance of this object, he called an international geographical conference, in 1876, to consider the best means to open up "the only portion of the globe where civilization has not yet penetrated, and to plant definitively the standard of civilization on the soil of Central Africa."

All the world was invited to join in this nineteenth-century crusade, for, as His Majesty said, "we in no way claim a monopoly of the good which can and ought to be done in Africa."

National committees were formed in many countries, including the United States, but only three of these organizations succeeded in accomplishing any permanent result. The German committee sent out exploring expeditions, which ultimately led to the occupation of German East Africa, and France undertook explorations in what is now the French Congo; but it was the Belgian committee which displayed the greatest energy and perseverance.

King Leopold took the matter in hand and, by his energy and his financial aid, supported and carried on the work, which was generally considered a humane, but quixotic, enterprise. "It was thought that the undertaking was beyond his power," as Sir Edward Malet said at the Berlin Conference, and that it was "too great for success."

At first, the Belgian exploring expeditions accomplished little; but in 1879 Stanley was sent out by King Leopold, and from that time the work made rapid progress. In five years, forty government stations had been established, steamers had been placed on the Congo River above the cataracts, hundreds of tribes had been visited, five hundred treaties had been made with the native chiefs, and the country had been occupied from the coast to Stanley Falls.

The Belgian committee, led by the King, had succeeded in founding an African Empire. It was not a colony of Belgium, but a separate state, governed by the International African Association, of which King Leopold was President. In 1884, the flag of the new nation was recognized by some of the great Powers as the flag of a friendly state, the United States being the first thus to greet the blue and gold ensign of the new African Power. The Powers did not create the Congo State; they simply recognized a condition of affairs already existing, viz.: that the Congo was a properly qualified, duly constituted and efficient government.

The "Scramble for Africa" had already begun, and the relations of the different governments concerned in the centre of the continent were becoming an intensely interesting problem. Towards the end of 1884, the Powers held a Conference at Berlin "to regulate the conditions most favorable to the development of trade and civilization in certain regions of Africa, and to assure to all nations the advantages of free navigation" of the Congo and the Niger. It has been sometimes erroneously said that the Berlin Conference created the Congo Free State and placed it under the control of King Leopold, retaining a right to supervise his work and to demand an account of his stewardship. This is a misapprehension. The Congo, as mentioned above, was already a sovereign state, and had taken her place in the family of nations months before the meeting of the Berlin Conference. The object of the conference was not to create the Congo State (which would be to do a thing already done), but to define the interests of the Powers (including the Congo) in the Congo basin, to make provision for "the open-door policy," and to secure cooperation for the suppression of the slave-trade.

The Plenipotentiaries at the Conference expressed high admiration for the noble ideals of the founder of the Congo State, for the great work already accomplished and for the perseverance of the King, who, as the Italian representative said, "for eight years, with a rare constancy, has spared neither trouble nor personal sacrifice for the success of a generous and philanthropic enterprise." "Throughout a long course of years," said Sir Edward Malet, the British representative, "the King, moved by purely philanthropic ideas, has spared neither personal effort nor pecuniary sacrifice in anything which could contribute to the attainment of his object. Still, the world generally viewed these efforts with an eye almost of indifference. Here and there His Majesty aroused sympathy, but it was in some degree rather a sympathy of condolence than encouragement."

The duty of suppressing the slave-trade was to devolve chiefly upon the Congo State, which occupies the centre of the continent. The new nation willingly undertook this tremendous task, and, as "Chinese" Gordon said, "no such efficacious means of striking at the root of the slave-trade was ever presented as that which God has, I trust, opened out to us through the kind disinterestedness of His Majesty, King Leopold."

The means were, indeed, efficacious; and, to use the words of Lord Curzon, "the Congo State has done a great work and, by its administration, the cruel raids of Arab slave-dealers have ceased to exist over many thousand square miles." The slave raids were abolished, but it was only after long years of warfare and at a great expense of Belgian blood. The struggle against the Arab slave-traders put such a strain upon the slender resources of the State that, at the Brussels Conference in 1890, the Powers modified their tariff agreement, so that the Congo Government might increase its revenue for the purpose of carrying on the good work. The eradication of the slave raids was, however, but one of the Herculean tasks accomplished by the Congo Government.

What was before a wilderness has now been made a garden. The districts formerly devastated by the Arab slave-raiders are now inhabited by natives who live in security and peace. Cannibalism and human sacrifice are rapidly disappearing. The country has been opened up to Christianity, commerce and civilization. About five hundred kilomètres of railway have been built and three times that amount are under construction, 15,000 kilomètres of waterway have been explored and are plied by steamers. The telephone and telegraph lines extend over 1,500 kilomètres, roads have been constructed and automobile wagons placed on them for traffic. The whole country is being developed by means of Government stations.

At the time of the Berlin Conference (1884-5) there were forty stations; to-day there are more than two hundred. Then there were five river steamers in Congo waters; to-day the government has a fleet of one hundred. Then there was one court of justice; now, including the courts-martial, there are nearly fifty. Then there were a dozen missionaries; to-day there are about five hundred missionaries, and one hundred and fifty mission stations. In 1887 the exports amounted to $400,000; at the present time they have risen to $10,000,000.

Rubber is the chief product of the country. A few years ago, the export of rubber was a negligible quantity, but now it has gained such proportions that the price of Congo rubber regulates the rubber market of the world. The cultivation of coffee, cocoa and cotton has been encouraged also. Whereas eight years ago there were only sixty thousand coffee-trees in the plantations, now there are about two million and the growth of cotton has been so

flourishing as to cause some disquietude among the cotton-growers of Egypt.

All this moral and material development of Central Africa has been accomplished in a remarkably short time, and is one of the wonders of the world. At the beginning of the enterprise, the nations applauded King Leopold's humanitarian designs, but did not lend a helping hand. They could see the philanthropy of putting down the slave-trade, but they could not see any material or financial benefit to be derived from the operation, and, hence, generally, they stood aloof. The Belgians, inspired by the confidence of the King, were finally induced to undertake the development of Central Africa, but the capitalists and merchants of other countries did not look upon the Congo as a paying proposition. For example, the agent of one foreign government reported that "nothing could be done without a railroad, and that there was not enough traffic to support a road." The facts proved otherwise. Congo Railway shares which in 1893 could be had at 325 rose five years later to nearly 1200. In the same way, other commercial projects which had been undertaken by the Belgians turned out to be enormously productive.

In the early days of the Congo, foreign capital was much needed and would have been gladly welcomed. Foreign capitalists were not, however, "bullish" on Congo speculations: like the man with one talent, they feared to risk their money and hid it in the earth, while the more adventurous Belgians invested in Congo enterprises and have received their own with interest. Hence it is that the Belgians are now reaping the larger part of the profits from the Congo. Foreign financiers failed to grasp their opportunity, and the Belgians have gone in, occupied the field, acquired valuable concessions and remunerative trade. The foreigners who arrive now, at the eleventh hour, find the best seats at the feast already occupied.

The door is not shut, however. The Congo State maintains the "open-door policy" for trade, in accordance with the Berlin Act, and all foreigners may freely enter and buy and sell and get gain. A few foreigners have, however, claimed a wider privilege than this, and have wished to go in and occupy Government land without permission of the State.

It is a well-known principle of law, recognized in America and England and in nearly every country, that all unoccupied or

ownerless land belongs to the State. When the Congo Government took possession of the territory in Central Africa, it allowed all actual owners and occupiers of the soil, both native and non-native, to register their lands and to become legal owners. All vested interests were scrupulously respected, and unoccupied or masterless land was declared Government property, in accordance with recognized legal usage and in accordance with the practice of nations. These lands contain, among other things, valuable rubber forests, which the Government either manages on its own account, or sells or lets out on suitable terms to private concerns. Concessions are granted in a similar way in the British possessions in Africa.

As Belgians have been chiefly interested in the development of the Congo, it is natural that most of these concessions and leases have been obtained by Belgian companies. It has been claimed that these leases or concessions constitute a monopoly, and that they are an infraction of Article V. of the Berlin Act. The stipulation in question provides that: "No Power which exercises, or shall exercise, sovereign rights in the above-named regions shall be allowed to grant therein a monopoly or favor of any kind in matters of trade."

Fortunately, the Berlin Conference asked two of its members, Baron de Courcel and Baron Lambermont, to make a report on the meaning of the stipulation, and their interpretation of the article sets forth the exact meaning as understood by the High Contracting Powers.

"What is the meaning of this stipulation?" says the report submitted to the Conference by MM. de Courcel and Lambermont. "Demands have been made for enlightenment on the subject. There should be no doubt about the strict and literal meaning which should be assigned to the term in "commercial matters" *(en matière commerciale)*. It relates exclusively to traffic, to the unlimited faculty of every one to sell or to buy, to import and to export, both products and manufactured articles. No privileged situation should be created in this respect. The field remains open to free competition in the domain of commerce, but the obligation of local Governments does not go beyond this."

It is evident from this official and authoritative interpretation that the contracting Powers had in mind the idea that there should be no differential treatment of merchants, but that they

should all be allowed to buy and sell on a fair footing. This agreement has been scrupulously fulfilled by the Congo State. There is nothing in the stipulation forbidding the Government to exercise its legal and customary right of leasing land, or granting to individuals or to companies certain tracts of territory for development. The Government has an undoubted right to sell its lands, or to rent them out, or to work them itself; and the purchasers or lessees holding these concessions of land have undoubtedly a right to the product of their respective tracts.

There is nothing in this contrary to liberty of commerce or free competition. There is nothing in it antagonistic to the letter or the spirit of Article V. It is a simple exercise of property rights. A farmer in America taking an orchard on lease would expect to have a right to the exclusive use of the fruit; and, if he objected to strangers entering and gathering his crop of apples, he would hardly be called a "monopolist" on that account. The granting of these leases and concessions is sanctioned by law and by the custom of nations. It does not constitute a monopoly as understood in law or as defined at the Berlin Conference.

One of the most civilizing and useful regulations introduced by the Government of the Congo is the law requiring the natives to pay a tax in labor. This tax is not excessive. It is estimated at forty hours per month, and for this work the native is paid at the usual rate of wages. Most strict orders have been issued with a view to securing the equitable division of the labor, the prevention of arbitrary exactions and a proper remuneration for the work done.

The State gives protection and the blessings of civilization to the natives, who constitute nearly the whole of the population, and who should bear some of the burden of the Government. Labor is the commodity in which it is most convenient for the natives to pay, and it is the commodity most needed by the State. The tax in labor is a distinctly civilizing influence. It teaches the native habits of industry, and it is by habits of industry only that he can be raised to a higher plane of civilization. In paying this tax, the native receives two rewards—an immediate reward in wages and an ultimate reward in being taught to work. Africa inhabited by idle natives is hopeless, but Africa inhabited by an industrious population is full of magnificent possibilities.

In order to secure the collection of this tax, it is necessary to treat the natives with paternal kindness. It is not by cruel treatment, nor by maiming them, nor by driving them into the bush that the State can obtain the manual labor which it needs. The native is one of the elements necessary for the development of the country, and the Government is too far-seeing, as well as too humane, to allow the destruction of the blacks, by whose hands alone the country can be developed. Mistreatment of the natives is not in accordance with commercial principles, much less with humanitarian ideas. To permit such a thing would be both a crime and a commercial mistake.

As officials and commercial agents are not recruited exclusively from the ranks of the archangels, cases of cruelty to natives will occasionally occur in all attempts to govern inferior races. In the Congo, such crimes are now rare and are severely punished. Not very long ago, some agents of a certain Congo company were guilty of cruelty, for which they were promptly tried and condemned; and it was observed that, immediately after these cruel acts, the profits of the concern fell off 98 per cent., which shows that maltreatment of natives and huge profits cannot go hand in hand. The very prosperity of the State is an indication that the natives are not treated harshly.

The State has sought to throw every safeguard round the blacks by means of the courts of justice, and also by means of a special Commission for the Protection of Natives, which is composed of Catholic and Protestant missionaries.

The Congo Free State has always considered the help of the missionaries as "indispensable to the realization of its views"; and it should be observed that the large majority of missionaries speak very highly of the good work the Government has done for the uplifting of the native and for civilization and Christianity.

Mgr. van Ronslé, one of the best known missionaries in the Congo, who was the first President of the Commission for the Protection of Natives, has written a very interesting letter from Leopoldville under date of July 28, 1903, as follows:

"The State condemns the abuses which come to its knowledge. The law is well organized, extends like a network over all the State territory, and is carried out in some degree independently of the administration. I have known a great many of the magistrates—very honorable men, who had their responsibilities very much at heart, performing

their duty in an independent and conscientious manner. How, then, is it possible to affirm that atrocities are erected into a system patronized by the State?

"I make it my duty in the present circumstances to pay the Government a tribute of admiration and gratitude — of admiration, in presence of the vast and fine organization that it has succeeded in establishing here after such a few years, and which astonishes even those who wish to injure it; of gratitude, for the benevolent protection and efficacious support which it has given to our missions."

Protestant missionaries, like Mr. W. H. Bentley, and the Rev. Dr. Grenfell who has been in the Congo for twenty-five years, have written of the administration in the highest terms of praise. Out of five hundred missionaries, it is only a handful who have expressed an unfavorable view of the Government.

An illustration of the reckless way in which stories of "atrocities" have been manufactured is furnished by the Burrows Case, which came up for trial in London last March. Mr. Burrows had written a book, which came out more than a year ago under the title "The Curse of Central Africa," and which contained many sensational accusations against the Government of the Congo and against the Belgian officers in its service. It was a book which was accepted by many as true history, and was quoted far and wide. One of the Belgian officers concerned, Captain de Keyser, brought suit against Mr. Burrows in the English courts; and, when the case came up, the whole fabric of calumny crumbled away. Neither the author nor the publishers produced a single witness or piece of evidence in support of their accusations, nor did they themselves go into the witness-box to explain or to attempt to justify their conduct. Captain de Keyser won the suit, with £500 damages, and the book was ordered suppressed.

One of the most interesting points about the case was the testimony tending to show that the book had been written, "not necessarily for publication," and that the publishers and author had tried to induce the Congo Government to buy up the manuscript for the purpose of suppressing it. There was produced in court an agreement signed by Mr. Burrows which reads as follows:

"I hereby agree to pay to Mr. John George Leigh the sum of £500 if and when my publishers, R. A. Everett & Co., receive the amount which may be paid by the Belgian Government for the non-publication of the manuscript by myself and him entitled 'The Curse of Central Africa.'

In case the book is published, I agree to pay Mr. Leigh one-third of the profits."

In addition to such attacks, a number of false reports about the administration of the Congo have been put in circulation by well-meaning people who have accepted the idle tales of the natives without investigation. The testimony of the natives is utterly untrustworthy. As a rule, they will say anything that suits their interest or their caprice. Not long ago, a number of them accused a certain Protestant missionary of murdering the engineer of the mission launch, and they maintained their accusation with great unanimity and persistency, although there was not the slightest foundation for the story. Disregard for the truth seems to be characteristic of the natives, not only in the Congo, but all over Central Africa. Mr. H. L. Duff of the British Central-African Administration, in his recent book, has called attention to this same unfortunate habit among the natives of Nyassaland.

Calumnies against the Congo have received wide circulation, but in the end truth will prevail. A great work has been done in Central Africa for humanity, for Christianity and for civilization. It is the master mind of the King that has planned the work, and it is his generosity which has made it possible. Not only did he support the enterprise in its early struggle for existence, but even now, when the budgets of the State have reached a more satisfactory condition, the King generously declines to accept the revenues from the Crown lands (which, in ordinary course, should go to the Sovereign), and has turned the money into a fund, managed by Trustees, for the improvement and development of the country.

"All men," said Stanley, referring to the Congo, "all men who sympathize with good and noble works—and this has been one of unparalleled munificence and grandeur of ideas—will unite in hoping that King Leopold, the Royal Founder of this unique humanitarian and political enterprise, whose wisdom rightly guided it and whose moral courage bravely sustained it, amid varying vicissitudes, to a happy and successful issue, will long live to behold his Free State expand and flourish to be a fruitful blessing to a region that was, until lately, as dark as its own deep, sunless forest shades."

BN. MONCHEUR.

SANITY AND SAFETY IN RELATION TO PUBLIC OFFICE.

BY ALLAN M'LANE HAMILTON, M.D., ETC.

THE words "safe" and "sane" have been used so frequently of late in connection with the coming Presidential election, the possession of those qualities by the candidates for high office being even made an issue by many, that it is of interest to question the relation of mental integrity or the reverse to the action of public officials generally; and, in this connection, it may not be amiss to refer to the peculiarities of the mental organization that may play a part in the conduct of men who fill important trusts, and in whom is invested a certain amount of power, which, if used improperly, may be to the detriment of certain communities, as well as of the country at large.

It need hardly be said that a public officer should be a well-balanced and mentally healthy man, in whom no suspicion of pathological weakness exists; yet, unfortunately, the line between normal mentality and its opposite is so confused, irregular and ill-defined that it is impossible to apply an absolute standard of psychic integrity, and the popular idea of what constitutes stability and all-round fitness is often at fault. This is inevitable so long as men by mere force forge ahead of their fellows, who rarely take into account defects which are overshadowed by apparent conventional soundness. General capability is rare, and not always to be expected; and absolute perfection, after all, means mediocrity. It is variety that gives individualism; and, provided there be no abnormal one-sidedness, we may be most unequal in our mental make-up, and still be well balanced.

Most of us are so willing to be infected with the genius of others that, often without due exercise of judgment, we choose an ideal

and worship him, until calm, sober second thought and experience convince us of his shortcomings or actual weakness. In monarchical governments, there is little escape from the burden of a line of hereditary weaklings; but, in republics, the limitation of official tenure sooner or later brings relief, even though we suffer temporarily for the hasty choice of the majority. Le Bon has made plain the contagious nature of example, and the complete upsetting, at times, of deliberate judgment under the stress of suggestion; of the infectious will of one person which has imposed upon others who are receptive and yielding; and of the disregard, as well, of all the restraints of common sense, so that a species of general hypnotism exists during a period of excitement. This sheeplike tendency of the crowd is only too well known to psychiatrists and sociologists. Almost from the beginning of history, we find that communities have been deranged to the limit of epidemic madness by the appearance and example of spurious Messiahs, political lunatics and other individuals who have applied the torch of delirious excitement and kindled the fire of turbulent fanaticism.

The analysis of every suddenly developed popular movement is likely to disclose some hysterical weakness, which is usually dependent upon an individual act of heroic proportions, or started by an appeal to the emotional side of the masses. Sometimes it has a religious tinge, and again it may be purely martial;* or, again, in times of general corruption, a valorous champion of the people may appear upon the scene. The long-suffering public will at these times impulsively flock to the standard of a self-satisfied leader, who may be some half-crazy reformer whose plans for relief and prediction of better things appeal more or less strongly. As a rule, his promises are empty, and the efforts cease when power has been actually placed in his hands, his subsequent career being

* It would seem to-day, especially, as if many ill-balanced officials were possessed by a spirit of personal exaltation, with an allied disposition to indulge in more or less harmful heroics. The *motif* is militarism of a hysterical kind, with a disposition, as far as possible, in time of trouble, to ignore the ordinary and long-established forms of available legal relief, which until now have been all-sufficient. This epidemic madness has even extended to Colorado, and Mr. Wellman's interview with a former "rough-rider" is suggestive of what is meant. This valorous gentleman, in response to an inquiry, is said to have replied: "Well, they started up that *habeas corpus* business, and I told 'em that wasn't any good—that what they needed was not *habeas corpus* but *post mortem*, etc."

characterized by occasional picturesque, and usually impotent, attacks upon vice which lead to nothing. The claims of such an individual are vapid, and his methods are distasteful to the confiding and mistaken victims who have pinned their faith upon him and invested him, perhaps, with extraordinary prerogatives. He is as likely as not to be a member of a certain large class of the unbalanced, recognized by the alienist, which comprises the victims of *paranoia reformatoria*. Possessed of little or no stability of mind, or power of judgment, he makes startling and dramatic raids upon the wrong-doer, disregarding the law which should guide him; or, if invested with the dangerous power of distorting the criminal law, he puts out of sight the rights of the unfortunate and perhaps innocent, or through sheer incapacity allows the guilty to escape. Not content with the sober and well-established precepts and methods of his calling, he resorts to others that are both outrageous and sensational. In this connection, the writer recalls the conduct of an eccentric and insanely conceited judge of a criminal court, who, in an important case, proceeded to interrogate a witness who was called to the stand, but from whom the prosecuting attorney, or the prisoner's counsel, could extort nothing. After admonishing the witness to disregard all others in the court-room and to look him "fixedly in the eye," he proceeded to searchingly interrogate, despite the objections and astonishment of both lawyers. There was something familiar and distinctly uncanny in the form of questions asked and in the conduct of the inquisitor, which recalled to the writer the Bernheim method of hypnotizing. It subsequently appeared that the judge admitted to a legal friend that he had bought and studied a well-known book upon the subject of hypnotism, and that he "found great aid in the use of suggestion." Luckily, the power of such a man is limited by the higher courts, but he is in every way a psychopathic example of what I mean. The saddest instances of mental deterioration are those which develop after a long, honorable and eminently sane career. Many old New York lawyers can recall the sudden transformation of an originally excellent judge who became insane, and subsequently rivalled the famous Jeffries in the cruelty and severity of his sentences, and who was allowed, through feelings of sympathy and pity, to remain on the bench for a long time, until his condition became so obvious that he was sent to an asylum, where he died.

In other lands, where the will of the people has so little to do with the choice of a ruler, we are furnished with numerous historical examples of the danger of hereditary mental defects. The lines of Hapsburg and Hohenzollern illustrate what is meant; and, though in both houses notable exceptions exist, there being immunes, like the first Emperor William, it is not difficult to find a distinct insane trace, which in times more remote found expression in cruelty, oppression and unmistakable insanity of other kinds, or, in recent times, by a mental degeneration which is strikingly exemplified in the present German sovereign. Though brilliant and vigorous in certain directions, as are many paranoiacs, his conduct is erratic and impetuous; and no one can possibly predict what form his latest explosion may take. Possessed of an idea of his own power and almost god-like supremacy, which more closely resembles that of the arbitrary rulers of less civilized ages, his delusional sense of greatness leads him to indulge in all sorts of eccentric and disorderly forms of the exercise of power. Though his attempts to regulate the art of Germany and to teach sculptors, artists, actors and musicians, and even ballet girls, are evidences of mild insane conceit, and do no great harm, his power for mischief is really dangerous when he becomes, as he does at times, the subject of a species of semi-religious exaltation. This was his condition when he addressed his troops previous to their departure for China, urging them "to kill." Again, his exaggerated sense of personal importance has led him to direct or bring about punishments for *lèse-majesté* which are not only extreme, but at times ridiculous. It has been said that the interfering criticism of this monarch is not due to an exaggerated estimate of his own capacity only, but to his own conception of his duty as an Emperor; and in this connection one of his critics has recently said: "It is a conception too apt to lead a man into an endeavor to set up a Napoleonic despotism over his subjects' feelings and tastes, and it is not surprising that the German artists, no less than the public, have resented such interference."

There are a number of degenerates whose mental weakness is of such nature that they are only regarded by their fellows as queer or odd, and who perform acts from time to time which are distinctly praiseworthy or even of apparent greatness, the really insane conduct in other directions being for that reason forgiven or overlooked. To this class of dysphrenics belong many indi-

viduals who are largely in the public eye. Ridicule is the usual reward of the querulous, litigating, reforming or extreme genius whose public career is marked by absurd acts so constantly exhibited as to make him a public bore. The soldier of a day struts about covered with decorations procured by misrepresentation, and indulges in the form of insane boasting known as "*pseudologia fantastica.*" The lawyer brings questionable lawsuits for the benefit of a public who do not need his help, or constantly figures in the newspapers, and the reformer of a certain character is always ready to interfere with the affairs and comfort of his fellows, provided he can get sufficient *kudos,* or even for the mere pleasure derived from meddling.

The morbid personality varies greatly in different individuals, and it does not follow that there is always moral degeneration. The motives of many of these unstable persons, to whom the name "mattoid" has been applied, have often been of the highest and best, and characterized by a distinct altruism. Indeed, this disregard of self has materially aided progress under certain circumstances. Unfortunately, the impulse of the psychopathic subject to do good, to relieve the down-trodden, or to correct evil, is not connected with a state of mind which enables him to properly recognize the consequences of a precipitate or tactless use of power. Such a person may be altruistic; but, as a rule, he unconsciously, in a measure, acts for the gratification of an insane vanity, or in obedience to an elation approaching morbidity. These men, and others, delight in personal decoration, in being photographed upon every occasion, and in oratorical efforts which are windy and empty, except that they sometimes leave in the mind of the auditor a catchy epigram or euphonious saying to be remembered. In all the strong qualities of mind they are deficient, and their mental processes and results are scattering and valueless. In reality, there is no balance, and, as in hysteria, there is often a morbid excitability of the memory, leading them to falsify unconsciously, or to live over in detail perfectly imaginary incidents, so that the individual believes himself a hero. With this exists what is known as the "facilitated release of volitional impulse" which is so characteristic of childhood. This unstable state is characterized by hyper-suggestibility, so that he responds very readily to all accidental influences. The emotional tinge leads such people to "mould" experience into conformity with them-

selves, and with this there is a morbid excitability of the imagination. There is usually an inadequate functioning of the judgment and reason, and a tendency to live ever in a fool's paradise.

Deffendorf, in speaking of the mental characteristics of the large class of unbalanced individuals who are not conspicuously insane, says:

"But, just as soon as anything extraordinary occurs, a mental shock or a temptation which demands discussion and decision of action, the mental and moral incapacity becomes evident. There is this item of susceptibility to new and accidental influences, which renders their view of the outside world incomplete and fragmentary. Such vague pictures lead to faulty conception, and form a basis for inaccurate judgment. As soon as ideation leaves the purely sensory field, the logical train of thought yields to the influence of lively imagination, while the sharp definition characteristic of general ideas disappears. Circumstances existing only in their imagination are of far more importance in their deliberation than actual facts. Thought, therefore, becomes unsteady, and shows many inconsistencies; patients vacillate in their plans from day to day, draw inconsistent conclusions from the same premises, and thus their views of life and the world lack reality. Their flighty conversation contains frequent repetition of certain high-sounding remarks and commonplaces, which often have little bearing on the case."

The popular standard of official sanity, rectitude, greatness, goodness and general capability, associated with calm dignity and temperamental stability, is undoubtedly that which has been fixed by most of our countrymen, who have been brought up to revere the memory of the first President of the United States. Possibly, some of this veneration is due to the influence of time, that has led to the amplification of those virtues which preponderated, and dwarfed the faults which, at most, were of the minor kind; for history is always disposed sooner or later to paint with extremes of color, so that she ultimately glorifies, or even deifies, on the one hand, or belittles or execrates on the other. An English critic has recently said that our American Presidents have been chosen from the ranks of those who possess no striking traits personally, nor suggest force,—in other words, that the only standard is that of mediocrity; and that, for this reason, they have been safe; but such a conclusion is by no means true. This kind of "mediocrity," which has had so much to do with the steady development of the country, has had no more striking exemplar in recent years than Mr. McKinley, whose administration will for-

ever be looked upon as one marked by stability, business-like methods, and official acts free from sensationalism, but far-reaching in effect. Like the living Cleveland, McKinley was moderate, calm, logical and deliberate, and rarely made mistakes; and here, as in other cases, we find that native mental vigor which was so conspicuous in the case of Lincoln, and is always evidence of the intellectual strength possessed by those who have hewn their own way, and from the beginning, largely through necessity, have been forced to cultivate their faculties—the result being a healthy mentality in which a high degree of reasoning power and judgment prevails. In the rugged American this exists, perhaps, to a greater degree than among other people; and the best kind of mental health is found amongst those whose advancement in life is connected with a struggle, more or less intense. In other words, they are really "born to greatness" in its best sense; for, in the beginning, they have everything to make, and, when the time comes for wider action and greater responsibility, they are prepared and competent.

In spite of political exigencies, and because of the temporary jingoism or hysterical excitement inseparably connected with the war crises of our country, men who were neither great in other ways than as soldiers, nor especially efficient, have been chosen. The long list of Presidents contains a large proportion of sane and useful men who have intelligently and successfully filled the first office of the land, and no less than nineteen of these were lawyers, a fact which confirms De Tocqueville's observation that the legal training is that which best qualifies and makes Presidents. In this connection, Mr. Olney, in his thoughtful speech before the Harvard Law School Association a few weeks ago, said: "I believe, and prefer to believe, that the lawyers of the day have not abdicated what is their normal function under every government having a right to be free or enlightened—that they are still the ruling class in our country, in the sense that, in matters of law and of government, they determine the predominant tone of the community." Six of our Presidents, including the immortal Washington, were soldiers, who, through the enthusiasm inspired by their valor, or in consequence of the gratitude of the people, were thus rewarded; but, with few exceptions, it cannot be said that these men were as successful as those who came from civil life, and in four cases the martial prowess seems

to have been the only qualification. At best, they have been indifferent Presidents; and sometimes, owing to their impulsiveness, they have been anything but "safe." As an example, while Andrew Jackson was, on the whole, a strong man, his impetuous temper, obstinacy and high-handed exercise of power betrayed a mental unfitness which led to general public uneasiness, and at times something more. When, in the face of the House and the Senate, he ruined the United States Bank in 1829, and subsequently created widespread disaster, although ultimately the withdrawal of government funds into the public treasury was beneficial, the means chosen were arbitrary and unnecessary. But, in spite of this disregard of immediate consequences to others, he was popular and great enough to successfully fulfil his administration; whereas men who have imitated his arbitrary methods have ingloriously failed; and it can be seen how an insanely arrogant and egotistic individual, invested with enough power, might cause widespread ruin through an arbitrary act. While Jackson had a conscious sense of his own strength, was fearless and independent to a dangerous degree, there were underlying sterling qualities which redeemed him. So far as the writer knows, no President or high official of the United States has ever been disqualified by reason of mental disease; although, without doubt, certain psychopathic individuals have been allowed to show their mental peculiarities to the discomfort of their associates. John Randolph, of Roanoke, was certainly of unsound mind, and it is not difficult to trace in his conduct a form of insanity to which reference has been already made. Among some people, there seems to be a disposition to consider the great Lincoln as not absolutely of sound mind, and whatever gave rise to such a view was undoubtedly due to his melancholy temperament, and to a certain strain of religious feeling which was occasionally expressed in a manner that was not entirely understood. It has even been asserted that he had hallucinations, but that appears to be unfounded in fact. In a personal letter to the writer his biographer, the Hon. John Hay, says: "He was a man of deeply religious feeling, rather than theological beliefs. There was a vein of mysticism which characterized him in all his life, but he was not what I would call superstitious, and so far as I know, he had no hallucinations." Although strikingly eccentric, his peculiarities of character, which did not in the least affect his phenomenal

greatness of mind, were largely the result of early environment and education.

The nomination of candidates for public offices of all kinds is too often made by those who do not inquire sufficiently as to the mental fitness of the men of their choice, whose estimate of what is required is superficial and one-sided. Such a person is too often taken at his own estimate, and if he be possessed of sufficient persistence and suggestive force his success may be due to the popular wave of excitement which he creates. Though the intelligent minority recognizes the mental deficiencies, which are familiar enough to the student of morbid psychology, the voting majority is apt to be delighted by fulminating manner and speech, the display of intense energy, which at times is laudable enough, but is apt to fizzle out before some great public work is barely launched.

Sudden changes in feeling or purpose, so characteristic of psychopathic subjects, are the rule, and the absence of tenacity of purpose, except so far as it applies to self-advancement of the individual, is conspicuous. Such characters rarely possess the independent moral courage which brings with it preparedness for disaster; nor the knowledge that even failure and criticism, and sometimes execration, on the part of the public and the press, count for nothing in the consciousness of right, and in the performance of duty. The great office of President, especially, should be filled by a man with administrative and executive ability, who has a thorough respect for the Constitution, and who possesses logical training, poise, modesty and self-control. The steed of Boulanger should not be used to carry a person into the White House, nor can the end be obtained by any number of *tours de force.* On the contrary, the successful and suitable candidate should come from the ranks of those whose lives have been marked by sturdiness and mental sobriety, and by careers that require development of thought, and that kind of force which is cumulative and generated by the gradual perfection of all the intellectual faculties, and of none at the expense of others.

ALLAN MCLANE HAMILTON.

LITERATURE IN THE NEW CENTURY.

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS, PROFESSOR OF DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

I.

THERE is no disguising the difficulty of any attempt to survey the whole field of literature as it is disclosed before us now at the opening of a new century; and there is no denying the danger of any effort to declare the outlook in the actual present and the prospect in the immediate future. How is it possible to project our vision, to foresee whither the current is bearing us, to anticipate the rocks ahead and the shallows whereon our bark may be beached?

But one reflection is as obvious as it is helpful. The problems of literature are not often merely literary; and, in so far as literature is an honest attempt to express life,—as it always has been at the moments of highest achievement,—the problems of literature must have an intimate relation to the problems which confront us insistently in life. If we turn from the disputations of the schools and look out on the world, we may discover forces at work in society which are exerting also a potent influence upon the future of literature.

Now that the century in which we were born and bred is receding swiftly into the past, we can perceive in the perspective more clearly than ever before its larger movements and its main endeavor. We are at last beginning to be able to estimate the heritage it has left us, and to see for ourselves what our portion is, what our possessions are, and what our obligations. While it is for us to make the twentieth century, no doubt, we need ever to remember that it was the nineteenth century which made us; and we do not know ourselves if we fail to understand the years in which we were moulded to the work that lies before us.

It is well for us to single out the salient characteristics of the nineteenth century. It is for us to seize the significance of the striking advance in scientific method, for example, and of the widespread acceptance of the scientific attitude. It is for us, again, to recognize the meaning of that extension of the democratic movement, which is the most evident characteristic of the past sixscore years. It is for us, once more, to weigh the importance of the intensifying of the national spirit and of the sharpening of racial pride. And, finally, it is for us to take account also of the growth of what must be called "cosmopolitanism," that breaking down of the hostile barriers keeping one people apart from the others, ignorant of them, and often contemptuous.

Here, then, are four legacies from the nineteenth century to the twentieth:—first, the scientific spirit; second, the spread of democracy; third, the assertion of nationality; and, fourth, that stepping across the confines of language and race, for which we have no more accurate name than "cosmopolitanism."

II.

"The scientific spirit," so an acute American critic defined it recently in an essay on Carlyle,—who was devoid of it and detested it,—"the scientific spirit signifies poise between hypothesis and verification, between statement and proof, between appearance and reality. It is inspired by the impulse of investigation tempered with distrust and edged with curiosity. It is at once avid of certainty and sceptical of seeming. It is enthusiastically patient, nobly literal, candid, tolerant, hospitable." This is the statement of a man of letters, who had found in science "a tonic force" stimulating to all the arts.

By the side of this, it may be well to set also the statement of a man of science. In his address delivered in St. Louis in December, 1903, the President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science,—who is also the president of one of the foremost of American universities,—declared that "the fundamental characteristic of the scientific method is honesty. . . . The sole object is to learn the truth and to be guided by the truth. Absolute accuracy, absolute fidelity, absolute honesty are the prime conditions of scientific progress." And then Dr. Remsen went on to make the significant assertion that "the constant use of the scientific method must in the end leave its impress

upon him who uses it. A life spent in accord with scientific teaching would be of a high order. It would practically conform to the teachings of the highest type of religion."

This "use of the scientific method" is as remote as may be from that barren adoption of scientific phrases and that sterile application of scientific formulas, which may be dismissed as an aspect of "science falsely so called." It is of deeper import also than any mere utilization by art of the discoveries of science, however helpful this may be. The painter has been aided by science to perceive more precisely the effect of the vibrations of light and to analyze more sharply the successive stages of animal movement; the poet also has found his profit in the wider knowledge brought to us by later investigations. Longfellow, for example, drew upon astronomy for the figure with which he once made plain his moral:

> "Were a star quenched on high,
> For ages would its light,
> Still travelling downward from the sky,
> Shine on our mortal sight.
>
> "So, when a great man dies,
> For years beyond our ken
> The light he leaves behind him lies
> Upon the paths of men."

Already had Wordsworth, a hundred years ago, welcomed "the remotest discoveries of the chemist, the botanist and mineralogist," as "proper objects of the poet's art," declaring that "if the time should ever come when what is now called 'science,' thus familiarized to men, shall be ready to put on, as it were, a form of flesh and blood, the poet will lend his divine spirit to aid the transfiguration, and will welcome the being thus produced as a dear and genuine inmate of the household of man."

Again, the "use of the scientific method" is not equivalent to the application in the arts of scientific theories, although here once more the man of letters is free to take these for his own and to bend them to his purpose. Ibsen has found in the doctrine of heredity a modern analogue of the ancient Greek idea of fate; and although he may not "see life steadily and see it whole," he has been enabled to invest his sombre "Ghosts" with not a little of the inexorable inevitability which we feel to be so ap-

palling in the master work of Sophocles. Criticism, no less than creation, has been stimulated by scientific hypothesis; and for one thing, the conception of literary history has been wholly transformed since the theory of evolution was declared. To M. Brunetière we owe the application of this doctrine to the development of the drama in his own language. He has shown us most convincingly how the several literary forms,—the lyric, the oration, the epic, with its illegitimate descendant the modern novel in prose,—may cross-fertilize each other from time to time, and also how the casual hybrids that result are ever struggling to revert each to its own species.

Science is thus seen to be stimulating to art; but the "use of the scientific method" would seem to be more than stimulation only. It leads the practitioners of the several arts to set up an ideal of disinterestedness, inspired by a lofty curiosity, which shall scorn nothing as insignificant, and which is ever eager after knowledge ascertained for its own sake. As it abhors the abnormal and the freakish, the superficial and the extravagant, it helps the creative artist to strive for a more classic directness and simplicity; and it guides the critic toward passionless proportion and moderation. Although it tends toward intellectual freedom, it forces us always to recognize the reign of law. It establishes the strength of the social bond, and thereby, for example, it aids us to see that, although romance is ever young and ever true, what is known as "neo-romanticism," with its reckless assertion of individual whim, is anti-social, and therefore probably immoral.

The "use of the scientific method" will surely strengthen the conscience of the novelist and of the dramatist; and it will train them to a sterner veracity in dealing with human character. It will inhibit that pitiful tendency toward a falsification of the facts of life, which asserts the reform of a character in the twinkling of an eye just before the final fall of the curtain. It will lead to a renunciation of the feeble and summary psychology which permits a man of indurated habits of weakness or of wickedness to transform himself by a single and sudden effort of will. And, on the other hand, it may tempt certain students of life, subtler than their fellow craftsmen and more inquisitive, to dwell unduly on the mere machinery of human motive and to seek not a rich portrayal of the actions of men and women, but an arid analysis of the mechanism of their im-

pulses. More than one novelist of the twentieth century has already yielded to this tendency, which is, no doubt, only the negative defect accompanying a positive quality. Yet it indicates an imperfect appreciation of the artist's duty. "In every art," so Taine reminded us, "it is necessary to linger long over the true in order to attain the beautiful. The eye, fixing itself on an object, begins by noting details with an excess of precision and fulness; it is only later, when the inventory is complete, that the mind, master of its wealth, rises higher, in order to take or to neglect what suits it."

The attitude of the literary critic will be modified by the constant use of the scientific method, quite as much as the attitude of the literary creator. He will seek ever to relate a work of art, whether it is an epic or a tragedy, a novel or a play, to its environment, weighing all the circumstances of its creation. He will strive to estimate it as it is, of course, but also as a contribution to the evolution of its species made by a given people at a given period. He will endeavor to keep himself free from lip-service and from ancestor-worship, holding himself derelict to his duty if he should fail to admit frankly that in every masterpiece of the past, however transcendent its merits, there must needs be much that is temporary admixed with more that is permanent,—many things which pleased its author's countrymen in his own time and which do not appeal to us, even though we can perceive also what is eternal and universal, even though we read into it much that the author's contemporaries had not our eyes to perceive. All the works of Shakspere and of Molière are not of equal value; and even the finest of them is not impeccable; and a literary critic who has a scientific sincerity will not gloss over the minor defects, whatever his desire to concentrate attention on the nobler qualities by which Shakspere and Molière achieved their mighty fame. Indeed, the scientific spirit will make it plain that an unwavering admiration for all the works of a great writer, unequal as these must be of necessity, is proof in itself of an obvious inability to perceive wherein lies his real greatness.

Whatever the service the scientific spirit is likely to render in the future, we need to be on our guard against the obsession of science itself. There is danger that an exclusive devotion to science may starve out all interest in the arts, to the impover-

ishment of the soul. Already there are examples of men who hold science to be all-sufficient and who insist that it has superseded art. Already is it necessary to recall Lowell's setting off of "art, whose concern is with the ideal and the potential, from science which is limited by the actual and the positive." Science bids us go so far and no farther, despite the fact that man longs to peer beyond the confines. Vistas closed to science are opened for us by art. Science fails us if we ask too much; for it provides no explanation of the enigmas of existence. Above all, it tempts us to a hard and fast acceptance of its own formulas, an acceptance as deadening to progress as it is false to the scientific spirit itself. "History warns us," so Huxley declared, "that it is the customary fate of new truths to begin as heresies, and to end as superstitions."

III.

The growth of the scientific spirit is not more evident in the nineteenth century than the spread of the democratic movement. Democracy in its inner essence means not only the slow broadening down of government until it rests upon the assured foundation of the people as a whole, it signifies also the final disappearance of the feudal organization, of the system of caste, of the privileges which are not founded on justice, of the belief in any superiority conferred by the accident of birth. It starts with the assertion of the equality of all men before the law; and it ends with the right of every man to do his own thinking. Accepting the dignity of human nature, the democratic spirit, in its finer manifestations, is free from intolerance and rich in sympathy, rejoicing to learn how the other half lives. It is increasingly interested in human personality, in spite of the fact that humanity no longer bulks as big in the universe as it did before scientific discovery shattered the ancient assumption that the world had been made for man alone.

Perhaps, indeed, it is the perception of our own insignificance which is making us cling together more closely and seek to understand each other at least, even if we must ever fail to grasp the full import of the cosmic scheme. Whatever the reason, there is no gainsaying the growth of fellow feeling and of a curiosity founded on friendly interest,—both of which are revealed far more abundantly in our later literatures than in the earlier classics. In the severe masterpieces of the Greek drama,

for example, we may discover a lack of this warmth of sympathy; and we cannot but suspect a certain aloofness, which is akin to callousness. The cultivated citizens of Athens were supported by slave-labor; but their great dramatic poets cast no light on the life of these slaves or on the sad conditions of their servitude. Something of this narrow chilliness is to be detected also in the literature of the court of Louis XIV.; Corneille and Racine prefer to ignore not only the peasant but also the burgher; and it is partly because Molière's outlook on life is broader that the master of comedy appears to us now so much greater than his tragic contemporaries. Even of late the Latin races have seemed perhaps a little less susceptible to this appeal than the Teutonic or the Slavonic, and the impassive contempt of Flaubert and of Maupassant toward the creatures of their imaginative observation is more characteristic of the French attitude than the genial compassion of Daudet. In Dickens and in George Eliot there is no aristocratic remoteness; and Turgenieff and Tolstoy are innocent of haughty condescension. Everywhere now in the new century can we perceive the working of the democratic spirit, making literature more clear-sighted, more tolerant, more pitying.

In his uplifting discussion of democracy, Lowell sought to encourage the timid souls who dreaded the danger that it might "reduce all mankind to a dead level of mediocrity" and that it might "lessen the respect due to eminence whether in station, virtue, or genius"; and he explained that, in fact, democracy meant a career open to talent, an opportunity equal to all, and therefore in reality a larger likelihood that genius would be set free. Here in America we have discovered by more than a century of experience that democracy levels up and not down; and that it is not jealous of a commanding personality even in public life, revealing a swift shrewdness of its own in gauging character, and showing both respect and regard for the independent leaders strong enough to withstand what may seem at the moment to be the popular will.

Nor is democracy hostile to original genius, or slow to recognize it. The people as a whole may throw careless and liberal rewards to the jesters and to the sycophants who are seeking its favor, as their forerunners sought to gain the ear of the monarchs of old, but the authors of substantial popularity are never those who abase themselves or who scheme to cajole. At the beginning

of the twentieth century there were only two writers whose new books appeared simultaneously in half a dozen different tongues; and what man has ever been so foolish as to call Ibsen and Tolstoy flatterers of humanity? The sturdy independence of these masters, their sincerity, their obstinate reiteration each of his own message,—these are main reasons for the esteem in which they are held. And in our own language, the two writers of widest renown are Mark Twain and Rudyard Kipling, known wherever English is spoken, in every remote corner of the seven seas, one an American of the Americans and the other the spokesman of the British Empire. They are not only conscientious craftsmen, each in his own way, but moralists also and even preachers; and they go forward in the path they have marked out, each for himself, with no swervings aside to curry favor or to avoid unpopularity.

The fear has been expressed freely that the position of literature is made more precarious by the recent immense increase in the reading public, deficient in standards of taste and anxious to be amused. It is in the hope of hitting the fancy of this motley body that there is now a tumultuous multiplication of books of every degree of merit; and amid all this din there must be redoubled difficulty of choice. Yet the selection gets itself made somehow, and not unsatisfactorily. Unworthy books may have vogue for a while, and even adulation, but their fame is fleeting. The books which the last generation transmitted to us were, after all, the books best worth our consideration; and we may be confident that the books we shall pass along to the next generation will be as wisely selected. Out of the wasteful overproduction only those works emerge which have in them something that the world will not willingly let die.

Those books that survive are always chosen from out the books that have been popular, and never from those that failed to catch the ear of their contemporaries. The poet who scorns the men of his own time and who retires into an ivory tower to rhyme for the sole enjoyment of his fellow mandarins, the poet who writes for posterity, will wait in vain for his audience. Never has posterity reversed an unfavorable verdict of an artist's own century. As Cicero said—and Cicero was both an aristocrat and an artist in letters,—"given time and opportunity, the recognition of the many is as necessary a test of excellence in an

artist as that of the few." Verse, however exquisite, is almost valueless if its appeal is merely technical and merely academic, if it pleases only the sophisticated palate of the dilettant, if it fails to touch the heart of the plain people. That which vauntingly styles itself the "*écriture artiste*" must reap its reward promptly in praise from the *précieuses ridicules* of the hour. It may please those who pretend to culture without possessing even education; but this aristocratic affectation has no roots and it is doomed to wither swiftly, as one fad is ever fading away before another, as Asianism, cuphuism, and Gongorism have withered in the past.

Fictitious reputations may be inflated for a little space; but all the while the public is slowly making up its mind; and the judgment of the main body is as trustworthy as it is enduring. "Robinson Crusoe" and "Pilgrim's Progress" hold their own generation after generation, although the cultivated class did not discover their merits until long after the plain people had taken them to heart. Cervantes and Shakspere were widely popular from the start; and appreciative criticism limped lamely after the approval of the mob. The "Jungle-Book" and "Huckleberry Finn" will be found in the hands of countless readers when many a book now bepraised by literary critics has slipped out of sight forever. Whatever blunders, in belauding, the plain people may make now and again, in time they come unfailingly to a hearty appreciation of work that is honest, genuine and broad in its appeal; and when once they have laid hold of the real thing they hold fast with abiding loyalty.

IV.

As significant as the spread of democracy in the nineteenth century is the success with which the abstract idea of nationality has expressed itself in concrete form. Within less than two-score years Italy has ceased to be only a geographical expression; and Germany has given itself boundaries more sharply defined than those claimed for the fatherland by the martial lyric of a century ago. Hungary has asserted itself against the Austrians, and Norway against the Swedes; and each by the stiffening of racial pride has insisted on the recognition of its national integrity. This is but the accomplishment of an ideal toward which the western world has been tending since it emerged

from the Dark Ages into the Renascence and since it began to suspect that the Holy Roman Empire was only the empty shadow of a disestablished realm. In the long centuries the heptarchy in England had been followed by a monarchy with London for its capital; and in like manner the seven kingdoms of Spain had been united under monarchs who dwelt in Madrid. Slowly had Normandy and Gascony, Burgundy and Provence been incorporated with the France whereof the chief city was Paris.

Latin had been the tongue of every man who was entitled to claim benefit of clergy; but slowly the modern languages compacted themselves out of the warring dialects when race after race came to a consciousness of its unity and when the speech of a capital was set up at last as the standard to which all were expected to conform. In Latin Dante discussed the vulgar tongue, though he wrote his "Divine Comedy" in his provincial Tuscan; yet Petrarch, who came after, was afraid that his poems in Italian were, by that fact, fated to be transitory. Chaucer made choice of the dialect of London, performing for it the service Dante had rendered to the speech of the Florentines; yet Bacon and Newton went back to Latin as the language still common to men of science. Milton practised his pen in Latin verse, but never hesitated to compose his epic in English. Latin served Descartes and Spinoza, men of science again; and it was not until the nineteenth century that the invading vernaculars finally ousted the language of the learned which had once been in universal use. And even now Latin is retained by the church which still styles itself Catholic.

It was as fortunate as it was necessary that the single language of the learned should give way before the vulgar tongues, the speech of the people, each in its own region best fitted to phrase the feelings and the aspirations of races dissimilar in their characteristics and in their ideals. No one tongue could voice the opposite desires of the northern peoples and of the southern; and we see the several modern languages revealing by their structure as well as by their vocabularies the essential qualities of the races that fashioned them, each for its own use. Indeed, these racial characteristics are so distinct and so evident to us now that we fancy we can detect them even though they are disguised in the language of Rome; and we find significance in the fact that Seneca, the grandiloquent rhetorician, was a Spaniard by

birth, and that Petronius, the robust realist, was probably born in what is now France.

The segregation of nationality has been accompanied by an increasing interest in the several states out of which the nation has made itself, and sometimes even by an effort to raise the dialects of these provinces up to the literary standard of the national language. In this there is no disloyalty to the national ideal,—rather is it to be taken as a tribute to the nation, since it seeks to call attention again to the several strands twined in the single bond. In literature this tendency is reflected in a wider liking for local color and in an intense relish for the flavor of the soil. We find Verga painting the violent passions of the Sicilians, and Reuter depicting the calmer joys of the Platt-Deutsch. We see Maupassant etching the canny and cautious Normans, while Daudet brushed in broadly the expansive exuberance of the Provençals. We delight alike in the Wessex-folk of Mr. Hardy and in the humorous Scots of Mr. Barrie. We extend an equal welcome to the patient figures of New England spinsterhood as drawn by Miss Jewett and Miss Wilkins, and to the virile Westerners set boldly on their feet by Mr. Wister and Mr. Garland.

What we wish to have explored for us are not only the nooks and corners of our own nation; those of other races appeal also to our sympathetic curiosity. These inquiries help us to understand the larger peoples, of whom the smaller communities are constituent elements. They serve to sharpen our insight into the differences which divide one race from another; and the contrast of Daudet and Maupassant on the one hand with Mark Twain and Kipling on the other brings out the width of the gap that yawns between the Latins (with their solidarity of the family and with their reliance on the social instinct) and the Teutons (with their energetic independence and their aggressive individuality). With increase of knowledge there is less likelihood of mutual misunderstandings; and here literature performs a most useful service to the cause of civilization. As Tennyson once said, "it is the authors, more than the diplomats, who make nations love one another." Fortunately, no high tariff can keep out the masterpieces of foreign literature which freely cross the frontier, bearing messages of good-will and broadening our knowledge of our fellow men.

The deeper interest in the expression of national qualities and in the representation of provincial peculiarities is to-day accompanied by an increasing cosmopolitanism which seems to be casting down the barriers of race and of language. More than fourscore years ago, Goethe said that even then national literature was "rather an unmeaning term" as "the epoch of world literature was at hand." With all his wisdom Goethe failed to perceive that cosmopolitanism is a sorry thing when it is not the final expression of patriotism. An artist without a country and with no roots in the soil of his nativity is not likely to bring forth flower and fruit. As an American critic aptly put it, "a true cosmopolitan is at home,—even in his own country," and a Russian novelist has set forth the same thought. It is the wisest character in Turgenieff's "Dimitri Roudine" who asserted that the great misfortune of the hero was his ignorance of his native land. "Russia can get along without any of us, but we cannot do without Russia. Woe betide him who does not understand her, and still more him who really forgets the manners and the ideas of his fatherland! Cosmopolitanism is an absurdity and a zero,—less than a zero; outside of nationality, there is no art, no truth, no life possible."

Perhaps it may be feasible to attempt a reconciliation of Turgenieff and Goethe, by pointing out that the cosmopolitanism of this growing century is revealed only in a similarity of the external forms of literature, while it is the national spirit which supplies the essential inspiration that gives life. For example, it is a fact that the "Demi-Monde" of Dumas, the "Pillars of Society" of Ibsen, the "Magda" of Sudermann, the "Grand Galeoto" of Echegaray, "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" of Pinero, the "Gioconda" of d'Annunzio are all of them cast in the same dramatic mould; but it is also a fact that the metal of which each is made was smelted in the native land of its author. Similar as they are in structure, in their artistic formula, they are radically dissimilar in their essence, in the motives that move the characters and in their outlook on life; and this dissimilarity is due not alone to the individuality of the several authors,—it is due chiefly to the nationality of each.

Of course, international borrowings have always been profitable to the arts,—not merely the taking over of raw material, but the more stimulating absorption of methods and processes

and even of artistic ideals. The Sicilian Gorgias had for a pupil the Athenian Isocrates; and the style of the Greek was imitated by the Roman Cicero, thus helping to sustain the standard of oratory in every modern language. The "Matron of Ephesus" of Petronius was the great-grandmother of the "Yvette" of Maupassant; and the dialogues of Herondas and of Theocritus might serve as models for many a vignette of modern life. The "Golden Ass" went before "Gil Blas" and made a path for him; and "Gil Blas" pointed the way for "Huckleberry Finn." It is easy to detect the influence of Richardson on Rousseau, of Rousseau on George Sand, of George Sand on Turgenieff, of Turgenieff on Mr. Henry James, of Mr. James on M. Paul Bourget, of M. Bourget on Signor d'Annunzio; and yet there is no denying that Richardson is radically English, that Turgenieff is thoroughly Russian, and that d'Annunzio is essentially Italian.

In like manner we may recognize the striking similarity—but only in so far as the external form is concerned—discoverable in those short stories which are as abundant as they are important in every modern literature; and yet much of our delight in these brief studies from life is due to the pungency of their local flavor, whether they were written by Kjelland or by Sacher-Masoch, by Auerbach or by Daudet, by Barrie or by Bret Harte. "All can grow the flower now, for all have got the seed;" but the blossoms are rich with the strength of the soil in which each of them is rooted.

This racial individuality is our immediate hope; it is our safeguard against craftsmanship, against dilettant dexterity, against cleverness for its own sake, against the danger that our cosmopolitanism may degenerate into Alexandrianism and that our century may come to be like the age of the Antonines, when a "cloud of critics, of compilers, of commentators darkened the face of learning," so Gibbon tells us, and "the decline of genius was soon followed by the corruption of taste." It is this spirit of nationality which will supply needful idealism. It will allow a man of letters to frequent the past without becoming archaic and to travel abroad without becoming exotic, because it will supply him always with a good reason for remaining a citizen of his own country.

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

THE MAKING OF MODERN RACES.

BY DR. P. CHALMERS MITCHELL.

MOST of us are familiar with the gray pellets, about the size of peas, which are sold to children under some such designation as "Pharaoh's serpents' eggs." When a light is applied to one of these it ignites, and expands into a long and spirally twisted coil of brittle ash that occupies much more than the space of an unignited egg. Many conditions go to the making of such a "serpent." The egg itself is composed of a mercury compound, a property of which is to combine with the atmospheric oxygen so as to form a bulky mass. A certain temperature, given at first by the application of the lighted match, is necessary to jolt the chemicals into combination. The shape of the serpent is the result, partly of intrinsic factors—such as the composition, mechanical mixture, consistency and shape of the egg; partly of external factors—such as the amount of oxygen in the surrounding air, the degree and the mode of application of the initial heat, the proportion of moisture in the air, the absence or presence and direction of draughts, the atmospheric pressure, and so forth. No doubt, comparatively violent chemical processes of this kind, occurring within a short space of time, are difficult to control; but it is easy to see that the production of uniformly shaped serpents from many eggs would involve merely the problem of making eggs of uniform shape and composition, and of allowing the chemical conflagration to take place only under uniform external conditions. In the actual experiments, made repeatedly by children, the conditions are tolerably uniform, and complete failure or the production of masses plausibly serpentine is the usual result. The vastly more complicated and delicate adjustments in the development of real eggs into real adults are similar in kind; the eggs fail to develop, or the creatures assume

an average final form in obedience to an average condition of surrounding forces, and, in so doing, bring about the average superficies of the race.

A curious and somewhat unexpected result of recent progress in biological knowledge is, that we are learning to attach an increasing importance to the effect of the environment in shaping the whole race by shaping each individual life. When the speculations of Weismann first threw doubt on the transmission of acquired characters, it seemed to many that, were his conclusions true, the ground was cut from under belief in the efficacy of the most plainly important of the forces that mould creatures into different races; but, although we are learning to discard from our conceptions belief in the inheritance of plastic effects, we are gaining an increasing knowledge of their extent and importance on individual lives. The eggs, or germinal masses, take from their parents, of which they were part, the power to respond in similar ways to similar external forces, and children resemble their parents in so far as the external forces operating on their initial material resemble those which went to the making of their parents. It is necessary to realize that the effect of these forces is ephemeral, and that it has to be reproduced in each generation; it is no more necessary to suppose the effects inherited than to suppose that the west wind, to-day slanting a thousand columns of smoke to the east, will produce a general tendency obvious in to-morrow's calm. Were the wind always from the west, we might forget so constant a factor, and come to regard an unvaried easterly inclination as due to something inherent in the nature of smoke and chimneys.

When similar conditions persist through many generations, another factor comes into play. Only those strains capable of responding in a favorable way to the prevailing conditions succeed; and there is a continuous and gradual elimination of all the other strains, until, after a sufficient time, they have been weeded out of the stock, and, practically, only such embryos are produced as are capable of responding in a particular average way to a particular average of conditions. All life has grown old and formal with regard to the most persistent features of its environment; many circumstances, now necessary to it, were once alternatives, and many to which it is now neutral may similarly become necessary for future branches and races.

The followers of Lamarck and of Darwin alike have accumulated abundant evidence of the existence and effect of these alternative external conditions. The constitution of most young creatures, which have passed through the narrow defile of embryonic life, is robust; changes of the incident forces that would arrest the fixed reactions of embryonic life, leave the free-living creature unharmed, although not unchanged, and have a vast influence in determining the average structure of the race in each generation. Alpine life, with its combination of decreased pressure and atmospheric humidity, greater radiation and extremes of heat and cold, causes great and immediate changes in all plants and animals not killed by the new conditions. Removal from the hills to the lowlands has been shown, in the case of Auvergne and Limousin in France, to produce immediate effects on plants, animals and men. Transference to a warmer climate thins the feathers of birds and the fur of mammals. Plants that usually bear thin, hairy leaves, may produce, under the influence of excess of moisture or of salinity, smooth or fleshy leaves, and the structure of many aquatic animals varies with the degree of salinity of the water they inhabit. In the lower Fungi and in Bacteria, the whole character of the organism changes so markedly with the external conditions that, before a reasonable definition of a form can be given, bacteriologists have to pursue its metamorphoses through a multitude of changing media. The nature of the food affects the size, appearance, structure and fertility of a very large number of animals and plants. Indeed, a large part of Natural History, ancient and modern, relates to the effects of these external factors; what the French call the "circumambient media" would be accepted as the active agents in producing the average characters of races by their plastic effects on individual lives, but for two sets of reasons, one set practical, the other historical. In nature, comparative experiments are seldom found together, and we are indisposed to seek for uniform causes of uniform results, forgetting that the average uniformity is as much due to averagely uniform conditions as the modifications experimentally produced in a few cases are due to unusual conditions. Historically, the effect of the circumambient media on individual lives has been obscured by controversy as to the transmission of that effect to progeny. Quite apart from such inheritance, the individuals which form a race

owe a large part of their common or racial characters to the effects produced on the initial material in each life by similar external conditions.

In the same fashion in which the embryonic stages have become rigidly adapted to fixed conditions by the elimination, during untold centuries, of all variations unsuited to these relatively fixed conditions, the later stages may also become rigidly adapted to special conditions. Plants or animals, originally endowed with the power of responding by different kinds of growth to different kinds of climate, may come to produce only forms capable of responding to one kind of climate by one kind of growth, if for a sufficient number of generations they have been subjected only to that one kind of climate. And so, by a process of selection, races gradually come to show a higher and higher average uniformity if they are subjected to similar average conditions. The longer the same or the similar conditions persist, the higher the average must rise, not only as a result of selection to the conditions, but as an automatic result of intercrossing. In the tenth generation a man has 1024 ancestors, from each of whom he may inherit something. One thousand and twenty-four individuals chosen at random would form a fair sample of any population, and the effect of this intercrossing is to obliterate gradually individual differences, and to smooth out the whole race into uniformity. However extreme a variation any individual may present, his children, inheriting not only from him, but from all his ancestors, are likely, with respect to the abnormality, to show progression toward the mean type, if the parental variation were towards degeneracy, regression towards the mean, if it were an advance.

Naturalists have long recognized the importance of Isolation, of what Darwin called the "corner-stone of the breeder's art," in accentuating the racial effect of the various moulding forces we have passed in review. If a group, consisting of members originally similar, be divided into two isolated groups, the combination of circumambient media is certain to differ in the two cases, and, generation after generation, the isolated groups will be moulded into different characters. Next, the action or incidence of selection will differ almost inevitably in the two cases. It is, no doubt, possible to imagine that a breeder might apply precisely the same discrimination in the case of isolated groups;

but in the more occasional and less relentless action of natural selection, identity of operation and result in two separate cases is almost impossible to imagine. Next, isolation must have its beginning, and the individuals forming each isolated part cannot be absolutely identical in average character from the first. Finally, the importance of the hereditary weight of mediocrity becomes of peculiar value under isolation, as that, in the first place, means the prevention of free intercrossing. From the moment of separation, the hereditary tendencies begin to be summed up in different directions; different racial averages, increasingly different as the isolation becomes more complete and more prolonged, are produced.

We must now turn to our immediate purpose, the application of these general principles to Man. The modern white nations, France and Germany, Russia, Italy, Great Britain and the United States are species of white man in the making. The increasing fervors of patriotism and nationalism are expressions of the fact that the nations are becoming self-conscious, and are realizing their increasing differentiations. The nations do not at present possess zoological differentiation to any marked extent, and the initial material that has gone to form them is much more similar than would appear from such current designations as Anglo-Saxon, Teutonic, Celtic, Latin, Sclavonic, and so forth. The stock from which have been derived these modern populations probably consisted of at least three old races. One of these, called the Mediterranean because of its historical and actual association with the shores of that inland sea, is marked zoologically by a relative prevalence of short stature, dark complexion, and long or, as it is termed, *dolichocephalic* head. The second, generally called Teutonic, although its centre is Scandinavia rather than Germany, and although it is not at all to be correlated with political Teutonism, presents the combination of great stature, marked blondness of skin, eyes and hair, and long-headedness. The third, called by Professor Ripley, the Alpine race, for obvious geographical reasons, intrudes between the others in a great wedge, its point towards the west, its base broadening through Central Europe towards Asia. It is intermediate between the others in stature and coloration, but is in marked contrast with regard to head form; for it displays a high average of brachycephaly or round-headedness.

We have no exact knowledge as to the origin of these raw materials of the modern nations, and still less idea of the forces that moulded them into their existing characters; but the speculations concerning them at least serve the purpose of stamping the conception of the races into the mind. There have been left from the far past, when the pulses of the Glacial Period were waxing and waning in Europe, rare traces of a primitive people, devoid of what we call culture, using only the rudest of stone implements, short and squat in appearance, in skull extremely long-headed, prognathous and beetle-browed. They appear to have left practically no traces among the surviving European populations, and it is only their primitive characters and their presentation in an extreme form of dolichocephaly, a salient racial mark, that suggest the possibility of their being the primordial material from which were shaped the Mediterranean and Teutonic races. Of these two, the former were, apparently, the first to spread upwards and northwards from the warmer South, probably from Africa. Remains of men approaching them in type, occur in the long barrows of North Europe, and many anthropologists see their modern survivors in the short, dark types occasionally met with in the remoter parts of the British Islands and in Brittany. There is hardly even a plausible speculation as to the origin of the Teutonic race from the primitive stock. It has the marks of a race more modern, specialized and local than the others. Its physical characters are extremely distinct and uniform; it is peculiarly associated with the sea and rivers, and has spread out more recently than the others from a compact centre in Northwest Europe, its greatest successes being almost within historical times. As it penetrated areas already in occupation, it showed disposition and capacity to secure the more fertile districts—the coasts, the rich valleys and the cities as opposed to the country. With somewhat less uncertainty, the Alpine race has been set down as Asiatic in origin, and it reached Europe, perhaps bringing with it the so-called Celtic culture, before the historical successes of the Teutons. It gained territory at the expense of the Mediterranean race, pushing that back towards the south, and apparently this process still continues; while the Teutons succeeded and continue to succeed in squeezing the Alpine race into the hills, and in driving them from the fertile valleys by continuous pressure from the North.

Such appear to be the materials of the modern white nations. In Europe, France has the most intricate admixture of elements; it has the Mediterranean race in the South, with probable survivors along the West to Brittany; the Alpine race occupies the Alpine provinces, with great outliers in the mountainous Morvan, Cévennes, Auvergne, Cantal, Gévaudan, Limousin and Brittany; the Teutonic race has invaded from the Northwest, occupying the Paris basin, Normandy, the great valley of the Loire and the fertile country down to Bordeaux, while in a narrow band it has occupied the Rhone to the sea. Britain has abundant relics of an underlying population comparable with the Mediterranean race, and most numerous in the so-called Celtic fringes; it had, almost certainly, in the men of the round barrows, a prehistoric invasion of the Alpine race which brought the Celtic culture; but these two sets of prehistoric British have been almost completely absorbed and swamped by successive and overwhelming invasions of Teutons—Saxons and Danes and Norsemen, and Normans from the Teutonic districts of France. Italy has practically only two races, the Mediterranean to the south and west of the mountainous axis of the country, the Alpine to the north and east. Russia is typically Alpine, with well-marked traces of more recent Asiatic invasion, and with some Teutonic infiltration from the northwest. Germany, in its eastern and southern parts, is strongly Alpine, much of its area containing population racially inseparable from that of Russia on the east, and from that of Switzerland on the south, while in the northwest the Teutons, who are thus not in the least characteristic of Germany, are to be found. The United States naturally have a recent extreme mingling of all three races, as its population has come from the populations of Europe.

The initial racial material, therefore, does not furnish much ground for expecting future differentiation among the nations; modern political frontiers do not in any way correspond to these old zoological distinctions. Whatever may have shaped the races in the past, existing forces are urging nearly identical racial material in different directions, and are compelling different material into convergent forms. Attempts, innumerable and unsuccessful, have been made to associate one or other of the races with mental or moral characters. Thus, as Professor Ripley has shown, the statistics of suicide and of divorce have been plotted

out on the map of France, and the areas of their greatest severity coincide in a striking fashion with the Teutonic as opposed to the Alpine racial regions. In France, too, crimes against property are associated peculiarly with the Teutonic areas, crimes against the person with the Alpine areas, while, finally, the Teutonic regions have a relative preponderance of radicalism and republicanism and of artistic, literary and commercial success. But these associations of character and race break down completely when the attempt is made to trace them in other countries; it appears simply that they are phenomena of environment and not of race. No one can doubt that acute differences separate France and Germany along their northern frontiers; and yet Alpine and Teutonic races stretch almost in parallel lines across them. It is to the environments of the present and of the future that we must look for the differentiating forces, and not to the results of the unknown agencies of the prehistoric past.

In considering the general principles of modification of animals and plants, we found that isolation of groups was a condition, if not necessary, at least extremely favorable. It is not necessary that the isolation should be geographical, as the essential circumstance is merely the prevention of interbreeding; nor that it should be absolute, but only that breeding within a group should be more frequent than interbreeding of members of different groups. In the case of the nations, the ethnical material, although not identical, does not present important international differences. Geographical separation certainly counts towards isolation; most individuals of modern populations are as firmly fixed to their native soil as are rooted plants and slow-moving animals. At first sight, it would seem as if modern civilized man, with the modern advantages of prevision, intelligence and mechanical locomotion, must be free from the limits of geography. But reflection throws doubt on this. An animal or a savage has little but the convenience of the moment to tie him to a particular area. His world consists of little beyond the limits of his own skin, and, wherever he moves, if he find food and rude shelter, he finds himself in an accustomed home. Modern man is bound to his locality by a thousand chains, forged by his own complex needs. To uproot a peasant and transfer him with his family and belongings even into the next county is a difficult matter, and the local permanence of populations is a clearly established result

of anthropological investigation. Naturally, it is greater in the case of rural populations, and in the case of women, with the result that the women of a peasantry always display the local type in its most strongly marked form.

But in man there are barriers tending to produce isolation other than those found among animals. First, there is language, with all its implications. In most cases, among the modern white races, marriage—and isolation is simply relative infrequency of intermarriage—is not a sudden affair of the passions, but a complex adaptation of interests, more difficult and less likely to be successful when the partners speak even different dialects. In this, as in other racial matters, individual exceptions prove nothing, their results being swamped in the broad averages; and it cannot be doubted that language helps to isolate the nations as practically as stormy arms of the sea or as snowy mountain-ranges. With language, in the case of man, and increasingly in the case of civilized man, there are associated a thousand barriers of thought and feeling, memories of past history, political and social ideals, differences that even where the geographical barriers are overcome tell strongly against any prevalence of interbreeding. A similar, and comparatively new, check on facilities of intercrossing is given by the innumerable regulations, made for diverse political, fiscal and military reasons, hedging the passage of the frontiers. All the great nations, while they welcome the casual visitor, are beginning to scrutinize the alien immigrant, some of them accepting him only under severe conditions, all of them holding him in little favor. It is needless to labor the point; we may take it as proved that the modern nations, almost year by year, are adding to the barriers that prevent free intercrossing of their populations, and are thus securing those conditions under which zoological, divergent modification is most rapid.

The seclusion of the nations is aided in another fashion by a process in which man himself plays a part. A breeder may divide his herd in two ways. He may take numerical halves at random and may allow the two groups to breed separately. In course of time, this "separate" breeding will result in differentiation between the groups. But the breeder, pursuing another principle, may place in one group all those displaying some character, say muscular activity, in another all those displaying, say, a docile temperament. In each generation he may continue this "segre-

gate" breeding, by transferring from one group to the other any forms which appear better suited to the group in which they were not born. Naturally, under such conditions, differentiation of the two groups in divergent directions is much more rapid, and in the case of the nations many processes with a similar result occur. There is a continuous elimination from many of the nations of those who by inborn disposition are out of harmony with the political systems and ideals of their natal lands. From Germany and Italy, and to a lesser extent from France, there is a drain of those who fear or dislike compulsory military service, and the ideas associated with a dominant militarism. From Russia, not only poverty and anti-Semitism, but aspirations for freedom and education, have expatriated many of her sons. America has been populated largely by immigrants repelled by the religious and caste systems of the Old World, and it begins to appear as if to a lesser extent the American peculiarities were being strengthened by the voluntary removal from the States of the sporadic types (abnormal there) in whom have appeared or persisted the old microbes of caste. The same conscious preferences act negatively. The military nations will not attract, and would not for long retain, immigrants of other dispositions. Moreover, the social systems of every nation aid in the differentiation by favoring individuals with a natural bias harmonious with the average disposition of the nation, and by hindering those naturally least harmonious. In France, for instance, despite the froth of the Boulevards, that man in whom, as Zola put it, the red corpuscles of the blood are Royalist, is more likely to be provided with a special train to the frontier than with the opportunity to place his kinsmen in prosperity. The great Russian thinkers on questions of economy, or even on science, find their way to Geneva or to London; the easy acceptors of an autocratic system rear families in bureaucratic comfort.

We must now turn to international differences in the direct action of the circumambient media, moulding the nations in different directions. In this subject, so far as man is concerned, we are as yet confined largely to analogy, and can hope for little more than to establish a case for further investigation. Although all the more fundamental conditions for the nine months' growth of embryonic man have long since been rigidly fixed, there is still reason to suspect that external conditions can play varying

parts. Extreme cases are known in abundance. Alcohol, cocaine, many bacterial poisons, and diseased conditions act on the growing embryo, through the blood of the mother, not only in the negative fashion of stunting growth, but positively, producing structural characters and physiological peculiarities. The influence of the nutrition of the mother is equally far-reaching, and has much to do with determining the physiological rhythm of the child. Children born of parents in a foreign land often differ from those born of the same parents in their own land, in fashions the analysis of which is baffling and obscure, but the total result of which is unmistakable. In the more usual case, where children are born in the land of their parents, it is impossible to doubt that the manifold differences in different countries as to the care, treatment, feeding and general conditions of pregnant women do play a notable part in determining the average national characters.

There is also an important selective action due to different environments. The practical measure of fertility is the number of children born alive. The causes that lead to the premature death of embryos have been little studied from a general point of view, but some known facts are suggestive. Statistics collected in one country showed that the average size of the head was greater in still-born children than in children born alive. Taking only in the most general way the relation between size of head and size of brain, and between size of brain and chance of intelligence, it may appear from this that conditions determining the physique of mothers and the choice of mothers may be setting limits to the brain-power of the race. Such conditions belong to the environment; they are questions of climate, food, air and so forth; and still more of the requisites sought for in wives, and the ideas according to which women are chosen or allow themselves to be chosen. All such conditions are essentially local, differing from nation to nation.

All marriages are not fertile, nor fertile to the same degree. The percentage of children produced by a total number of couples differs in different countries, according to innumerable differences which are part of the national environment and character. Climate, mode of life and food are obviously differentiating agents, but the habits, ideas and economic systems of the nations have more to do with it, partly by determining the average age at

which the responsibilities of married life are assumed, and partly in a more direct fashion. Prudential restraints on fertility assume an extreme importance in different nations, according to their general prevalence, and still more according to the sections of the population which exercise them most. Local conditions, mental, moral and economic, determine whether any class at all sets deliberate limits to its natural fertility, and whether it is the landholding, the professional or the urban populations which handicap themselves in their contributions to future generations. Moreover, not only the absolute fertility but the incidence of fertility differs with local conditions. Suppose that, of one hundred couples, eighty become fertile in one environment; if the same hundred were transferred to another environment, eighty might still be fertile, but it would be a different eighty. The incidence of the percentage of children with regard to the whole population varies with physical conditions and with mental, moral and economic factors, and operates not merely through influencing the fertility of married couples, but in choosing the couples that do marry.

The final result of this part of our subject is that environment, in the largest sense of the word, is a great agent in producing, from similar initial stocks, populations of very different average character, partly by direct action on development, partly by affecting the percentage of fertility and the incidence of that percentage. All these results occur separately in each generation; but, apart from any inheritance of acquired characters, they must be summed up in the course of generations by the continual elimination of certain elements, and by the continued favoring of other strains in the populations.

When we turn to consider the action of the environment in moulding the youth and the adult, we are on ground much of which is familiar, although it has not been systematically explored. When a special environment acts for even a limited period on an adult, it almost invariably writes on him a local mark. Who has not noticed such in an American returned from five years in the *Quartier Latin,* in a young Scot on holiday from a New York counting-house, in a member of the Embassy of any country home from service in a foreign land? We set down the changes to imitation, conscious or unconscious, and think little of the slight alterations in dress, the new tricks of intonation and

gesture. But even these, superficial as they are, are the results of reactions to new ideas and new circumstances; they are the beginning of the most salient differences that give character to modern races. But these changes, and still more the changes in physiognomy, palate, habitual diet, digestive power and so forth, all have their definite physical correlates in the tissues and fibres of brain and body, and in the physiological rhythms. The body has become different, different in itself and in its reaction to normal and abnormal stimulation. All such changes are produced in a more marked fashion when they act throughout life, and in a fashion still more marked when they act from one generation to the other, gradually moulding the whole population in one direction.

With modern civilized people, however, the circumambient media have their greatest effect on mental qualities, and it is by mental qualities that men are most markedly separated. Profound and increasing differences of temperament and of idea, the cumulating products of environment, tend to separate the nations. Here there is an enormous difference between characters peculiar to man and those which he shares with lower animals. Physical differences are slow-moving secular affairs, their summation being effected, probably, only through the ages by selective elimination. It is improbable that their effects are transmitted; each new individual has to be restamped by the environment, the only difference from generation to generation being a slow elimination of material refractory to the prevailing mode of stamping. The results of the environment on the mind are reflected in literature and the press; they traverse whole populations with almost instantaneous rapidity, and yet limit themselves to the confines of one nation, since the members of a nation that read an alien literature or that take their daily prejudices from an alien press are a negligible quantity. And every new acquisition by a literature is inherited; the new generation begins with the stage at which it found its predecessor, and every wave of emotion, of sentiment, of idea, that traversed the former generation is stored in its literature. There is no greater difference in the acquisition of characters than that between a plant propagated by slips and a plant propagated by seeds. The whole series of the former and its descendants is a continuous life; the effects of each kindly ray of the sun, each pruning or grafting by the gardener, of each

condition of soil and temperature, are permanent things, lasting while the plant lasts. But, however a plant may have been cherished and changed in its individual life, the seedling grown from its seed has to start afresh from the dim beginning of life. Literature is a new organ of a nation, integrating its units into a new whole by a new circulation, and this new organ retains permanently the results of each generation, and is the great example of rapid change by the complete summation of all acquired characters, corresponding in this respect to the generations of a plant propagated by slips.

The ideals, emotions, political and social systems, conceptions of religion, of justice, of public danger and public utility, and the commercial and military organizations, are complicated modern factors which tend more and more to mark off the nations, and all these grow and accumulate by the new method peculiar to man. These differences, profound, far-reaching and acute, are felt the moment the frontier is traversed; and, when some special crisis brings them into prominence, we find that already members of two nations find it almost impossible to come to common ground in working out what would appear to be the simplest and most common problems of morality or justice. I have heard an average, honest Englishman argue by the hour with an average honest Frenchman on the Dreyfus case, with the result that each saw in the other a stupid or cynical perverter of morality. All such differences act afresh on each generation subjected to them, but with a growing force, the result of their accumulation in the perennial and enduring stock of written and spoken ideas.

In association with all such growing differences as we have been passing in review, selection acts strongly, favoring the natural variations in accord with them, eliminating the naturally inharmonious variations. A simple example may serve to illustrate this operation. Each form of athleticism requires for its supreme display some different combination of natural qualities. The rowing-man, the cricketer and the cyclist employ different groups of muscles, different senses, different forms of endurance, and different mental and physical capacities. Before cycling was invented, the peculiar combination of qualities necessary for great success in that sport without doubt existed, but passed unnoticed and unrewarded. With the appearance of cycles, cycle-racing and the advertising needs of cycle manufacturers, there came into

existence the demand and the reward for the possessors of the combination, hitherto valueless, and, almost simultaneously in many countries, the new type came to meet the new demand, not created by it, but selected by it.

And so in different countries different factors stimulate different sets of the population; the incidence of favor and of rejection differs. Education, conducted on different standards and with different aims, brings rewards to different kinds of natural variations, and makes different sets of natural variations unsuccessful. The modern English reverence for success in athletic sports is the result of a profoundly complex combination of mental and physical factors. It brings with it more commercial reward to the holder of a University "blue" than to the holder of a University fellowship, and brings success—on the Stock Exchange, in business, in the teaching profession, and even in the Church—to the "good sportsman." Spreading favor and disfavor in a thousand ways, it affects the incidence of prosperity, and gives the national type a permanent set. In what direction any particular factor serves to bias the future, is an intricate problem not easy of solution. For what are selected are not peculiar qualities, but men in whom these are prominent, and with the men are favored, as if by accident, all the other individual peculiarities possessed by them. Moreover, in a paradoxical fashion, insistence on certain qualities may lead to the extinction of these. In Catholic countries, for instance, where the celibacy of the clergy is required, it would seem as if from each generation there were eliminated those elements of the population in which the ideas of purity and of religion were most strong and most faithfully fulfilled. In a succession of wars, those most ready to fight for their country are the most likely to be eliminated, and in this we may find explanation of the strange fashion in which rowdy and exuberant patriotism is the product of years of peace, while devastating wars, by killing off those most ready to fight, inaugurate a compulsory era of peace.

It is impossible within the limits of this article to follow out in detail the interactions of environment, selection and population from even the general point of view, and still more impossible to work out individual cases. Of the many problems awaiting compendious treatment, perhaps the most immediately interesting are presented by Great Britain and the United States, the

two nations fatuously grouped as Anglo-Saxon. Every possible indication points to diverging paths for these. The initial material, in the first place, differs more than most of us care to admit. The population of America has come from every nation in Europe; that of Britain, for many hundred years, has received only trifling accessions from other lands. The population of America has been drawn from Europe not merely by blindly chosen samples, but by a process of selection, in which the spirit of adventure, of enterprise, of determination to risk unknown rather than to endure known evils, have played a great part, not only in stocking America with these characters, but in depleting Europe of them; and who shall say that the almost febrile activity of America is merely the exuberant vitality of a young nation, and not so much the result of a definite selection from the stocks of Europe? The mode of life, climate, food, moral and social ideals, political aspirations, legislation, press and literature of the two nations all differ so profoundly, and the proportions of intermarriage as compared with home marriage are so small, that he must indeed be blind to the plain facts of science who expects any other result than the production of increasing divergence. And finally, the two nations are in different stages of zoological progress. Great Britain is in the case of an old race which has spread to many distant regions, and in which local differentiation is proceeding along different lines. The United States are in the younger stage of integration; notwithstanding their huge continental area, what appears to be occurring is the gradual breaking down of the differences which, in a less populated stage, began to be formed; and the result is that an American type and not a series of local types is being produced, a type which will be new, and as unlike the Englishman of to-day as he is unlike the Frenchman or the Russian.

The general conclusions towards which I have been leading in this essay are simple. There are known very many factors the operation of which leads to the differentiation of common stocks of living beings into new species. The goal of this process is reached when the species differ so much in body, habit and disposition, that even in the absence of isolation they are relatively or absolutely infertile with one another. I have attempted to give evidence of the existence and operation of such factors, and, in addition, of special new factors in the case of the modern white

man. The subject is vast and complex, and there is clamant need for prolonged and careful collection and classification of the facts, and I hope that, at the least, I have made out a case for such new study. In the old times, man was an animal, swayed only by the rude forces of love and hunger; and yet, under conditions of which we are ignorant, primitive man broke up into well-marked physical types, such as Negro, Mongol and White, and the beginnings of infertility are at least suspected to exist between these. The infinitely subtler and more responsive nature of the modern white man, and the greater complexity of the forces that play on him, render him liable to diverging changes more complete and more rapid. I believe that the great nations are *foci* of these changes; that they are incipient species moving apart with increasing rapidity, under the stimulus of all the factors and conditions which have made species in the past, and driven by new forces heretofore unknown.

P. CHALMERS MITCHELL.

HOW GOOD CITY GOVERNMENT MAY BE HAD.

BY LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN, GOVERNOR OF RHODE ISLAND.

I.

THE government of cities is conceded to be the most perplexing of American problems. Fortunately, it is also true that no political question is attracting from publicists a closer attention. With the rapid conversion now going on of villages into cities, and of small cities into great ones, the true basis for a municipal charter cannot be fixed too soon.

Just now a controversy is under way between what is known as the Federal plan and a system of State Boards. Both of these methods have been tried, partially at least, and neither of them in practical operation can be pronounced a signal success. But before condemning, or even examining to advantage, any existing models, a previous question must be decided. And to that question, which underlies all forms of municipal government, however diverse, this paper seeks an answer.

The principle of self-government is simple. It rests upon the conviction that adult persons of sound mind can best look after their own interests. Unquestionably, this is true of the individual and of the family. The young man or young woman who depends upon others will not only lose strength, but is very likely to lean upon a broken reed. In like manner, that family is best cared for whose members are on the constant look-out for its welfare. The reason for this is plain. The family possesses the greatest knowledge of its own needs and resources; it has both the power and disposition to give close attention to details; and it must bear the consequences, good or bad, of any action taken. It goes without saying that no outsider and no other family can be in possession of the same information regarding it or feel an equal interest in its welfare.

What is so evident as to an individual or a family is also true of a community; and upon this hypothesis our American form of government was based. The result of a trial of more than a century and a quarter must convince the careful student of history that the theory is correct. Whenever and wherever the principle of self-government has been adhered to faithfully, it has vindicated the wisdom of its originators. Its most perfect application has been in the New England town-meeting, and that by common consent is pronounced an undoubted success. From time to time, a like excellence has been manifest in State and national affairs. Whenever the people have been thoroughly aroused, when our antiquated system of elections, so badly adapted to record the sentiments of the voters, has been coerced into some degree of obedience to the popular will—on these occasions self-government has been real. Such an awakening of the people of the North occurred when the Republican party, under the leadership of Lincoln, Sumner and Seward, came into power on the slavery issue. It has happened also at intervals in nearly every State and city; and, in each instance, corrupt politicians being relegated to the rear, public affairs have taken on a better aspect. Unfortunately, because of the time and skill required to manipulate successfully our election machinery, the rule of the people in such instances has proved to be but temporary.

It may be objected to the theory which advances self-government as the best means of obtaining good municipal administration, that cities are better governed abroad than in the United States. This is true; but in Great Britain, at least, it may be accounted for by two peculiar facts. One fact is, that the custom has long prevailed there, even under a system of elections but little superior to our own, of selecting and continuing in the city government men of great ability and high character, without regard to their partisan views. An opportunity to do this is afforded by another custom there prevailing, to wit: the retirement from a successful business career of men in the prime of life, ready, without pecuniary compensation, to give many years to the service of the public.

The other fact is, that the wisely drawn Municipal Corporations Act of Parliament leaves the fullest powers to the municipal council. Indeed, almost its only express directions relate to suffrage qualifications, manner of conducting elections, method of

assessing taxes, conduct of charitable trusts, incurment of debt, and to the purchase of land and buildings. The council elects the board of aldermen, the mayor, the treasurer, the clerk, the auditors and such other officers, including heads of departments, as it deems necessary. It has complete control of police, streets, lighting, public buildings, water-works, local courts, sanitary regulations, ward boundaries; of education, when there is no school board, and of the enactment of ordinances.

Practically, therefore, the British city has a greater degree of self-government than the American city. And it may be added that the conditions above stated, which have there brought about a fuller self-government, do not exist in any one of the United States, and cannot be transplanted.

Notwithstanding the general acceptance in this country of the inherited theory that self-government is best, yet the control of cities through the instrumentality of State Boards is becoming year by year more common. Whenever a State official receives his pay from a municipal treasury, the principle of self-government is violated. If, in addition to his salary, other sums of money are taken by the State from the local treasury to be expended by the State official, deep injury is added to the insult. Moreover, when the voters of a city cannot, either directly or indirectly, select every individual who disburses the taxes they pay, misgovernment in that city cannot be laid at the door of its electors. The greater the power such State officials possess, and the more money such a board disburses, the less reason is there to attribute defects in local government to popular incompetence. Pre-eminently is this true where, as recently in Pennsylvania, the chief executive of a city is appointed by the State, or where, as in Maryland, Ohio, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, police commissions, and other important municipal boards, are appointed by and responsible to State authorities.

But, it may be said, most of our cities have been free from such interference with home rule, and yet not one of them has been well governed—not so well governed as some of the cities in which State Boards exist. That is all true. Neither the so-called Federal plan, nor, in fact, any kind of plan, has thus far proved satisfactory to the inhabitants of a city, or commended itself decidedly to outsiders.

One reason, and doubtless the chief reason, for the acknowledged

imperfection of municipal government is that charters have been made for the people of a city, but not by them. This criticism holds, whether the charter is the product of special legislation, or is a general law for all the cities of the State. A ready-made charter imposed upon a city by an outside party, the State, is open to precisely the same objections, which everyone would perceive if the United States were to frame constitutions for Territories when these are admitted as States.

The only way in which a city can possess real self-government is by making and controlling its own charter. That is to say, its original charter, and any change subsequently made in it, must be adopted at the polls by the people of the city; and, more than that, the committee, or commission, or convention, which frames or revises the charter, must be a body of men as perfectly representative as possible of the electorate which is to live under the charter. These two simple but imperative demands of self-government have never been met. City charters, even when drawn up by local authorities, have either been fashioned by incompetents, or else have been compromises deemed necessary, though objectionable, by the misrepresentative committee which framed it.

In New England, when a town, because of increased population, becomes a city, the electors find many of their cherished rights taken away. Reference is here made not to the power previously exercised by the freemen of fixing the rate of taxation, and appropriating to various public purposes the taxes to be paid in, for these losses are expected and in a measure unavoidable; but, besides, they discover, and no doubt with surprise, that very many other limitations are imposed upon them without any option having been given them, except the general consent implied in the acceptance of the compromise charter when submitted to popular vote. The inhabitants of the new-made city soon find that they continue to be subject to substantially the same general State laws as before, but that, in addition, many of the charter provisions (to say nothing of a multitude of new ordinances restricting their former freedom of action) comprise details which are objectionable and prove to be unwise. In fact, the details of a city charter must be looked after by its authors rather than by the people: and, as is well known, selfish interests, partisan considerations, and improper compromises, too often determine the action of the persons who really draw up the charter.

II.

A city charter is the city's constitution, a local organic law controlling all ordinances and acts of city officials. As such, it should be framed with like care and in the same manner as a State constitution. No outside body should have anything to do with its details, or with any part of it which is peculiar to that city. Indeed, all State laws relating to cities should be of general application and need not be numerous. Under such general laws, each city should have the power to determine all special features for itself. Among the few State requirements, it is essential to include careful directions for framing or revising the charter, and also for its amendment. Such provisions, indeed, should be included in every State constitution, for then, and then only, will they be at all permanent.

The selection of the men who are to draft a city charter should be provided for as in the following Constitutional Amendment:

"ARTICLE —— OF CITIES.

"SECTION 1. If at least one-fifteenth in number of the legal voters of any city, or of any town qualified to become a city, shall, sixty days previous to any general election of State officers, file with the Secretary of State a petition that the electors may, at such general election, cast their ballots for or against the question, "Shall this city (or town) hold a convention to frame a city charter?" the Secretary of State shall submit such question to the electors of said city, or town, at said general election, and, if then approved by a majority of the electors present and voting thereon, such convention shall assemble twenty-eight days after said election.

"Said Secretary of State at said election shall provide ballots for the election of fifteen delegates to constitute said convention. In such city, or town, any party, or other group of voters, numbering one per cent. of its qualified electors, may nominate not exceeding fifteen candidates for the office of delegate. The names of all candidates shall be placed upon the same ballot, but no elector shall be allowed to vote for more than one candidate. Each such party, or group of electors, shall be represented in said convention in the proportion which the whole number of votes cast for its candidates for delegate bears to the total number of votes cast for all candidates for delegate, and, whenever so represented, it shall be by such of its candidates as receive the highest number of votes. The charter framed by said convention shall be submitted to the qualified electors of such city for their adoption or rejection by majority vote. In no other way shall a charter be made or revised for any city."

A careful examination of the above suggested amendment to a State constitution shows that the convention provided for will

be more perfectly representative of the electorate than any legislative body which ever met. With fifteen distinct and leading views having each its chosen representative, the convention will mirror the sentiments of the electors. Having a perfect freedom of choice, such as this amendment provides, the voters of any city ought certainly to succeed in selecting fifteen citizens well qualified to draw up a charter for their future government. Should the result be unsatisfactory, the alternative remains of defeating the proposed charter and trying to do better another year.

But when a charter, in the main satisfactory, has finally been secured, it may still be that in some details it does not meet with the approval of a majority of the voters; and, in any event, as time goes on, changes will be needed and demanded. It should be possible to make such specific changes without the trouble and expense of calling a convention, and yet without running the risk of having the charter either subjected to influences without the city, or mutilated by ill-considered action within.

To this end, a second section should be added to the constitutional article already proposed, as follows:

"SECTION 2. If at least one-tenth in number of the legal voters of any city shall, sixty days previous to any general election of its city officers, file with the city clerk a petition proposing a specific and particular amendment to the city charter, and asking that the electors may at said city election cast their ballots for or against such proposed amendment; every proposition so made shall be submitted by the city clerk to the electors at said election, and if then approved by a majority of the electors of said city present and voting thereon, it shall, thirty days thereafter, become a part of the city charter, and in no other way shall any city charter be amended."

It will be seen that such a constitutional provision would enable a majority in any city to make such changes in its charter as they saw fit, provided each subject was dealt with separately. Under this proviso, no complex propositions, which, while improving one phase of the charter, might injure another, could be used to confuse and perplex the people.

Assuming that, given suitable instrumentalities for shaping their wishes, the people of American cities are capable of self-government, it would seem that no objection from any unselfish source can be raised to either section of the article here formulated. Especially is this the case when we consider that no city

in the United States, however cultivated its inhabitants, can be said to possess good government—a government satisfactory to the majority. Indeed, it may be questioned whether, under any existing charter, a city in which every voter was a college graduate would find itself well governed. The worst governed of our cities, the one possessing the most ignorant and least homogeneous population, ought to have good government under the proposed system, for the reason that, when the people of a community large enough to form a city subdivides voluntarily into fifteen natural classes, each of them, with scarcely an exception, will be found capable of selecting worthy leaders. This would be the case if the city were made up of fifteen nationalities, each speaking a different language. As the legal profession can best select a judge, the medical profession a health officer, a labor organization its leader, so any class in a community which, under free opportunity for choice, decides to act together politically will make a wise selection of its representative.

It is true that, under the plan proposed, the law-breaking class of a city, if they constituted one-fifteenth of the population, would have the power to elect one delegate; but the character of the citizens represented by that delegate would be known, and, however able he might be, as one of a convention of fifteen composed almost wholly of well-meaning men of no less ability, his influence in moulding a charter favorable to lawbreakers would be very small—indefinitely smaller than under the existing so-called majority system of elections, which frequently gives to lawbreakers the balance of power over numerous candidatures.

The plan here presented would give to the electors of a city complete and continuous control of their local government. It would enable them not only to devise a better charter than any now in existence, but also to correct speedily any evils developed by a practical experience of its workings.

The doctrine of self-government, and the method of its application which are here set forth, necessarily exclude all government of municipalities through State Commissions. The "Federal plan," no doubt, would be given a fair test, and out of that or some better system, would be evolved a good city government.

LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN.

PROHIBITION—WHY?

BY SILAS C. SWALLOW, CANDIDATE OF THE PROHIBITION PARTY FOR THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE use of alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes has never benefited one human being, either physically, intellectually, morally or financially, in all the history of the world. But, on the other hand, it has injured, and even ruined, millions of human beings for time and eternity.

Therefore, the liquor traffic, sales in which in the United States last year amounted to over $1,400,000,000, has been and is a curse to the individual; to the family, and, especially, to that defenceless portion known as women and children; to labor, which it cripples; and to the taxpayers, who must pay for the support of the paupers, the criminals, and the insane it produces.

Hence, it is not true that, "if you let liquor alone, it won't hurt you." The innocent must suffer with the guilty. The abstaining taxpayer must pay his own taxes and, in addition thereto, the taxes which the drinker could have paid but for his indulgence.

The traffic is such an enemy to the church, and to the highest interests of the race as championed by the church, that Catholicism is organizing everywhere Total Abstinence Societies; and Protestantism, through several of its denominational utterances, has said that "no political party should receive the support of Christian men, so long as it fails to put itself on record in an attitude of open hostility to the liquor traffic." Both the Republican and the Democratic parties, having thus failed, men who vote for either thereby vote themselves as unchristian; since a man who does what he knows he ought not to do is not a Christian. Many Civic Societies have excluded liquor-sellers from eligibility to membership therein. Many liquor-sellers will

employ only abstainers to handle their poison. Many life-insurance companies make a special premium for abstainers. Few employers will tolerate drinking habits in their employees. Eight hundred thousand of the 1,200,000 employees on American railways are under orders neither to drink intoxicants nor enter the places where intoxicants are sold, on penalty of dismissal from service.

The Supreme Court of the United States, on December 5th, 1887, declared that: "It is within the discretionary police powers of a State to protect public health, safety, and morals, even by the destruction of property; and that the Kansas laws, providing for the destruction of property used in connection with liquor-selling, do not violate the provision of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution against the destruction of property." That was equivalent to saying that the machinery and wares of the liquor-seller are not property. Again, the Supreme Court said: "No legislature can bargain away the public health or the public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants."

And yet the United States Government in 1862 entered into, and has ever since continued, a copartnership with the liquor traffic, sharing its profits as revenue, and protecting its interests; since taxation always implies protection to the man and to the property taxed. The Government's share of the blood-money is less than two hundred millions. For every dollar of revenue, it costs the Government over sixteen dollars to care for the results of the business, as found in asylums, almshouses and criminal courts. The National Government overrides State prohibitory laws, sending its poison into prohibition States, and there legalizing its sale in violation of State laws.

It is estimated that three-fourths of our eighty millions of people are total abstainers. The one-fourth drink an average of seventy dollars' worth of liquor annually. A family of six persons would thus consume four hundred and twenty dollars' worth, if all drank, or enough to pay for a very comfortable home every two years. Of the twenty millions who drink, one-half are practically homeless. They live principally in the slums of our cities and towns. They constitute the dangerous classes.

The politicians, from President down, in some instances knowingly, or in wilful ignorance, depend largely on the buying of

this slum vote to carry the elections. The party managers claim that it required over six millions of dollars to elect Mr. McKinley. Much of this money was spent in corrupting the ballot. M. S. Quay, who managed the Harrison campaign, said: "As goes New York State, so goes the Union. As goes New York city, so goes the State; as goes one ward, so goes the city. Hurry on your money." And the money rolled in almost as freely as water; certainly as freely as whiskey. The ward was carried, so was the city, the State, the nation. It has come to be understood that no political party which antagonizes the rum vote can elect its candidates. The 250,000 liquor-sellers vote solidly for the man they want. They know neither morals nor politics, but only business. Each dealer is supposed to control ten votes. Thus two and a half millions of votes go with the party that is likely to do most for their business, or, at least, that will promise most.

The church vote of five millions, on the other hand, divides on the question of the tariff, even at a time when the difference in the revenue between a Republican tariff bill and one presented by the Democrats was less than fifty millions, while the direct cost for liquor that very year was twenty-five times that amount. The church vote, therefore, practically joins with that of the crime-makers, to fill jails, asylums, almshouses and penitentiaries, and at the same time to deplete the churches. The members of the churches do so under the stress of party spirit, for the purpose of keeping in line with the strong parties, which are greatly in the majority as compared with the prohibition partisan forces, and ostensibly for "saving the country," just this once more, from the great calamity of having the other party candidates elected.

When it is said that "Prohibition don't prohibit," it is meant that prohibition don't annihilate.

This is true of the prohibitions of arson, larceny, murder and all the other crimes in the catalogue, and yet no one clamors for the repeal of the laws against them on the ground, forsooth, that "Prohibition don't prohibit."

When we remember that the national Drink Bill last year was more than twice as much as the capital stock of all the National Banks; that it was more than half as much as the amount of deposits in all our savings-banks; that it was one-third more than our entire public debt; that it was one-half as much as the

value of all our domestic animals; that it was more than half of the value of all our farm products; that it was little less than the capitalization of all the industrial combinations, including the much-complained-of trusts, as they existed in 1900; that it was a third more than our total imports of merchandise, and a twelfth more than all of our exports; and then when we remember that the people who consumed this liquid poison would have been infinitely better off if they had made a big bonfire of their money, instead of purchasing with it a substance hurtful to all the interests of the individual, the family, the community, the State and the nation, we have reason to lament our folly, and wonder whether it will ever end.

Just now many thousands of laborers are on strike for more remunerative wages, in order that they may have the "full dinner-pail" promised four years ago, but which in too many instances is nearly empty, because of the excessive cost of living, growing out of the cornering of the necessaries of life by unscrupulous worshippers of Mammon. On the other hand, many employers of labor are suspending their employees, on the plea that there has been an overproduction, and that we must wait till the stock is reduced as the result of the buyers catching up with the producers. The real reason for this distress among workmen, in the midst of plenty, is not overproduction, but underconsumption.

Instead of spending over fourteen hundred millions of dollars for liquid poison, if this enormous sum had been spent in the purchase of shoes for the millions of bare feet; for hats with which to cover hitherto hatless heads; for cotton and woollen goods to take the place of the rags and tatters in which the denizens of the slums are everywhere arrayed; for carpets to cover the bare floors of the tenement districts; for tables, and chairs, and stoves, and bedding, and food, all of which would have so greatly ministered to the physical comfort, the intellectual growth, and the spiritual uplift of the submerged classes; every factory would now be running on full time, new factories would be in process of building; railroads would be stretching out their iron arms to communities hitherto unfamiliar with the music of the locomotive's whistle; and such an era of prosperity would be dawning upon this land as the world never dreamed of before.

We are in the midst of a conflict, as irrepressible as was that

concerning slavery forty-five years ago, when the Greeleys and Garrisons, the Gerrit Smiths, the Phillipses, the Sumners and the Sewards raised the battle-cry that "this country could not remain half-free and half-slave." The conviction is growing rapidly upon the American people that this country cannot long remain half drunk and half sober. That the profit-sharing partnership existing between the Government and the liquor business must soon be dissolved; or, that there will come to us as a nation such punishment, in the form of national reverses, as history shows has come to all the nations who have put upon their coin "In God we trust" while they study to do the work of the devil.

In conclusion, let me say, in the language of another, that there is honor enough in American Citizenship to warrant the appeal now being made to it by the Prohibition Party. The same hands that made the traffic secure through the ballot will yet, by the same process, rob it of its defence. Trembling before the thunders of a righteous wrath, it will flee for shelter, and there shall none be found. But, unmourned and unpitied, like a hunted beast brought to earth at last, it will shrink and shrivel, and die before the blasting power of an awakened national conscience.

SILAS C. SWALLOW.

MASCULINE AND FEMININE OCCUPATIONS.

BY MARION FOSTER WASHBURNE.

THE industrial expansion of women which has marked the last quarter-century has been accomplished in the face of an opposition by no means yet at an end. Every now and then reactions have set in, and, on the whole, these have been salutary in their effect. Such a reaction prevails at the present moment, affording the wary a welcome pause for reflection.

There are ample grounds for opposition. For one thing, the cry grows louder that men are being crowded out by women. Office forces are now almost wholly composed of women. There are not only many more women teachers in the public schools—the Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1889 gives the per cent. as 68.3, and that ratio has almost certainly increased—but the number of girls in the higher grades and in the High Schools is steadily greater than that of the boys. This means, of course, that there are more women than men who are receiving the training necessary for the better-paid business positions—not the best paid, but the middle places. In fact, I think it could be shown that, outside of the lowest places, those requiring the greatest amount of physical strength and the least amount of brains, and of the highest places, those involving executive ability of a high order and bringing in the greatest rewards, women are occupying the fields of labor with a rapidity well calculated to carry dismay to a conservative mind.

This brings about, of course, a disorganization of industries hitherto planned to meet masculine exigencies alone. Women, it must be admitted, do introduce a disturbing element. For one thing, the sex-ferment is uncomfortable in business places. It may, to be sure, and probably does, break the monotony of the long day's work; but it also interferes considerably with the

smooth running of the commercial machine. For another thing, women are frequently not able to support the long, relentless hours of work required by modern industrial routine. In our large office-buildings, rest rooms for women have become a necessity; and I agree with Mrs. Thompson that the sofas in these rooms are seldom without their burden of pale, exhausted women. It looks all wrong. One's instinct is to ask where their fathers and brothers are, or alas! their husbands. When one learns that the men of the family are out of work, or work only part of the time, or get too low wages to support their families, one is inclined to wonder whether the old way was not the best; and whether these poor things would not be better off at home cooking or sewing, while the men folks toiled in the hard ways of the world.

And this brings us to another difficulty: the vexed question of wages. One instance will illustrate the effect of the employment of women in the lowering of wages. We have already seen what the percentage of women teachers is; these women receive on an average $38 14 a month, while the men receive $45 25. It is plain that women are willing to work for less than men, and that, as long as they are, more of them will be employed, wherever possible; and the pay of men will have to be lowered to meet their competition. Is it not clear that if there were a law forbidding the employment of women teachers, there would be an increase in the number of men employed and in the salaries paid to them?

Besides these valid objections, there is the complaint that women are less skilful workmen than men; that they work in the expectation of marriage and therefore half-heartedly; that they are seldom well trained, because this same expectation makes them impatient of long apprenticeship; that they have no business faculty; that they lack system; that they are too personal and too emotional. At this point the objectors, even if they be men, begin to get a little emotional themselves. They point with pain, almost with tears, to the unsexing influence which business pursuits have upon the woman herself. Either, they say, the woman twists the definite, manly business system to suit her exigencies—a thing not to be tolerated for a moment,—or she is herself warped to meet the situation. She is either unfeminized or broken on the wheel; and what decent man wants her to be either?

Moreover, while woman is upsetting business at this rate, what is becoming of the home? We are invited to consider the woful

increase of flat-buildings, apartment hotels, boarding-houses, childless homes, and divorce. In an appreciable number of cases, married women have been known to prefer working in a store to doing their own housework. Young women may be found by the scores in offices who cannot darn their own stockings nor wear a thimble with more grace than a man. They may be able to make fudges over a gas-jet, but not to make bread. They know nothing to speak of about children, nor do they want to know, any more than their brothers. In very truth, what sort of wives will these young things make? And if they are not, after all, extraordinarily efficient as business women, it does seem as if they had reached a point in their development where they are equal to the demands neither of the old ideal, nor of the new.

Having thus, I hope, done justice to those who oppose woman's industrial expansion, let us see what the women have to say for themselves. Since a business life is so hard on them, since it seems to go against what is commonly supposed to be the strongest instinct a woman has—namely, the instinct for maternity—powerful motives must be at work to force so steady a movement out of old conditions into new. To assign cheap reasons for anything happening on so large a scale, and involving such serious consequences, is not the part of wisdom. For if a certain movement is seen to be steadily progressing, meeting obstacles now and then, but never materially checked, an astute observer will give over remonstrance and go to investigating the cause.

The most obvious cause for the phenomenon we are here considering is the fact that women want financial independence. They want, indeed, as complete independence as their comparatively infirm bodies will permit. Instead of weakening this desire, natural to all human beings and increasing with every step of advance in civilization, their physical peculiarities intensify it. They see that, if they have not money enough to live on in their own way, they are virtually slaves, compelled to live, not as they would like to live, but as some one who can support them would like to have them live. Without such independence, their very virtues cease to be virtues and become mere bids for favor.

The desire persists in spite of the deepening recognition that women who take care of the house, bear and train the children, and perform the other duties incidental to wifehood and motherhood, in reality earn their own living, and more too. But their share of

the family income is still called "allowance," if, indeed, it is definite enough to have a name at all. And the independence of the most satisfactorily married woman is less than that of the unmarried woman in receipt of a salary. I remember being present once at a meeting of women—it was a suffrage meeting—when money was called for. Most of those present had come in their carriages; all wore good clothes and the fingers of some of them, as they fished in their lean purses, glittered with diamonds, but none of them had more than a very little money. The fact finally came to open speech, and the women explained that, while they had credit at the first-class stores, they had almost no actual cash: that was one of the things that made them interested in suffrage. They thought that, if women were recognized as the political equals of men, they might come, by and by, to be recognized as their economic equals.

These were married women for the most part, and women of position. The situation is more tense with the unmarried ones. For, whatever men may think in general about women in industrialism, the change has now progressed to that point where, if a woman is not married by the time she is, say, twenty-five, her male relatives feel that she ought to be looking out for something to do. The man who, on a small salary, cheerfully supports his own or his wife's adult, able-bodied, unmarried female relatives is an exception. If he has one thrown on his hands, in all probability he does his best to get some work for her, at anything respectable she is able to do; and then, when she is comfortably disposed of, he talks about the harm women are doing by taking positions that, otherwise, men might occupy.

And what about the unmarried woman's own position? Would she not be unworthy our respect and her own if, being able to earn her living, she declined to do it, using her sex as an apology for habitual pauperism? In the ranks below the middle this has long been settled; the working-woman is expected to work as much as the working-man. In the middle ranks, it is becoming settled, though still it ferments. In the top ranks, it is far from settled. In all of them women prize their financial independence, and are willing to pay for it the high price of health and comfort.

Even on the supposition that the special duty of women, the duty of bearing children, must necessarily come before any other, because upon it rests the welfare, the very existence of the race,

there still remains something to be said for the women who are forced to recognize other duties and obligations. We have spoken of unmarried women; these are a considerable and by no means insignificant army; but there are also the childless women, to whom has been denied the right to perform the paramount duty, and who must consequently find for themselves some secondary duty, or confess themselves useless; and there are—a large and piteous class—the women with children to support and no man to support them, the widows and the worse than widowed. What is to become of all these human beings? Are they to be foisted on some competent and tyrannical mother-in-law, to be ruled, as in China, while some man earns food and clothing for them all? Wages would indeed have to be raised considerably to enable him to do it! And, dear me, where would be the peace of his home?

Great as is the force of this cumulative desire for freedom on the part of women, a desire strengthened by indulgence, it is reinforced by quite another desire, springing from even greater depths—the desire for a fuller, larger womanhood. No one can know women at all well, can attend their clubs, read their literature, see them in their homes, and not know that the best and most enlightened of them feel themselves to-day narrowed and starved, unequal to the demands made upon them by a rapidly advancing civilization. They confess themselves inadequate wives and mothers. They chide themselves bitterly for the hitches in the running of the domestic machinery, although these hitches are, very likely, not due to any personal shortcomings. For instance, it is reported that for every forty thousand emigrant servants landed at Castle Garden, over one hundred thousand situations are waiting: a fact that makes it plain that even a conscientious and competent mistress may not be able to get or keep good servants. And this adds another straw to the burden of domestic responsibility, and sharpens the consciousness of inadequacy. No one can long endure the suspicion of failure in one direction, without trying whether, in some other, he cannot prove himself a success. Nor can one discover that all alone one cannot make one's home what it should be, without going abroad for sympathy and for help.

Yet another factor is adding its weight to the steady pressure that, against all fears, is forcing women into industrialism. The more competent a woman is, the more time she has to give to large

affairs outside of the home, and the more she desires to give it. Suppose, for instance, that she has given twenty years to education, twenty more to child-bearing and rearing, there are still twenty good years at her disposal, twenty full, ripe years, rich with experience, years during which, if she has been wise in her care of herself, she is stronger and better able to work than she ever was before in her life. What is such a woman to do? Sit down and fold her hands, retire from her brimming life, while yet she is in the full tide of it? Has the world no need of her disciplined forces, her knowledge, her ability, her self-control, her tested power of endurance? It is evident enough that nothing of this sort can be. Working forces, whatever they may be, whether in the form of a woman, or otherwise, seek and find a place for themselves, and in the end accomplish their appointed tasks.

What, then, since there are such difficulties on both sides of this vexed controversy, is the appointed work for women? This is the question we are, all of us, trying to solve. We are doing a lot of pushing and hauling about it, a good deal of protesting, and it all seems to be quite useless. There are good arguments on both sides, and things go right along regardless, anyhow. We might sit here in the corner and reflect awhile, not at all expecting to settle anything, but rather to comfort our disquieted souls.

Well, then, I have a guess to hazard: I guess that all occupations have their masculine and feminine sides; that nothing whatever is exclusively masculine or exclusively feminine, but that every occupation, every pleasure, every form of human activity has that about it which is specially fitted for man's nature, and that which is specially fitted for woman's nature; and that in reality no activity can be at its very best until it is carried on by both sexes.

It seems reasonable that there should be every kind of work for both men and women, when we reflect that women are of the same race as men, and therefore likely to be influenced by much the same desires, and to be able to satisfy them in much the same way? We confuse the issue when we make use of arguments based on the assumption that men and women are as distinct from each other as if they belonged to different races; the truth is that they are much more alike than they are different. We are led to make the assumption by means of a curious confusion of thought. In the first place, we are surprised at the differences which show

themselves, because they are contrasted against a background of fundamental similarities. The background, being that of our own habitual consciousness, does not intrude itself upon our attention; the differences outlined against it do. Hence we notice the differences sharply, exaggerate their importance, and arrive at the conclusion that they are greater than the resemblances!

Of course, we really know, when we stop to think about it, that women are human beings much more markedly than they are female beings; and that, therefore, we must provide for their human wants first, and for their sex wants second. Their first obligation is not to the race, but to themselves, just as self-preservation precedes and outranks in importance race preservation. This is because race preservation, among the higher creatures, is not at the expense of the individual, but by means of the individual.

Let me illustrate what I mean by a homely parallel. Close beside me, as I write, are two fox-terriers, Bob and Beth. The difference between their characters is perfectly apparent to any one who knows them. Bob is more sedate, stronger, more obedient; he is an indomitable fighter; has great endurance; and tolerates Beth's playfulness with a superb masculine disdain. She is silkier, slenderer, with livelier ways, and a much greater fondness for caresses. She has no inclination whatever to obedience. When she is called peremptorily—in any tone, in fact, that does not smack of dinner—instead of coming, as Bob does, she rolls over on her back and holds up appealing paws. She is the more excitable watch-dog, jerking out, on the slightest token of an alien presence, a sharp yappy bark vibrant with nerves. But anybody who should argue from these differences that she was of a different race from Bob, ought to see the two running down the fields together, their white, short-haired bodies, with the round black spots on the hind haunches, bounding over the ground with the same undulating spring, their dark ears flopping, their stumpy tails stiffly upright, the white part down the centre of their noses of the very same width. He would be put to it to tell which was which, and could never, under normal circumstances, suppose one to be a dog and the other a donkey.

I think it could be successfully maintained—but I do not want to attempt it now—that women are not only as human as men, but that the sex difference is slighter than the differences between persons of different nationalities. In our own country, for in-

stance, I think that the average American man would feel himself more akin to an American woman than to a colored man or an Indian. He might possibly find more in common between him and, say, his wife or his mother, or even his sister, than between him and a Russian or a Turk, although these latter were of his own sex.

If this is so we should expect to find it as justifiable to portion out industries according to nations as according to sex. And, indeed, it is quite true that some such apportionment does spontaneously take place. But we do not therefore think it necessary to restrict nations to those industries for which they show the most aptitude. Because England excels in manufactures, we do not think of chiding her for indulging mildly in agriculture. Nor because Russia is largely an agricultural nation do we object to her doing what manufacturing she pleases. In national affairs, we realize that such forbidding would be as preposterous as futile. But when the question of woman in industry comes up, we abandon this cool-headed, sensible attitude, and maintain with heat that, on the one hand, the sex differences are so great as to unfit her for certain large branches of industry, and that, on the other, they are so slightly rooted that, unless protected, they will disappear!

Furthermore, the entire contention that woman's work is in the home, and man's outside of the home, rests upon the assumption that we know what belongs to woman and what belongs to man. We have, each of us, a lovely little theory about what constitutes manliness and what womanliness, and this opinion we are ready to enforce at the point of—well, public opinion. Since we plainly do not know, why not experiment? The success that has followed such procedures in other fields might lead us to hope for some results if we should decide to make right conditions, furnish a nutrient jelly, and let the masculine and feminine bacteria develop in freedom.

Nor would such a procedure be very unsafe. Nobody can possibly believe that men and women, alone of all created beings, have a perverse tendency to act counter to the laws of their own existence. Therefore, only by setting them free to act as they please and watching them do it, can we form any reliable judgment as to what those laws really are.

We may find that men are more womanly, and women more manly, and both more human, and every individual more diverse,

than we had supposed. Or we may find that there are, indeed, well-defined lines of separation, but that these are more interlinked than we have supposed—that which is masculine on the plane of physical force being feminine on the intellectual planes; or something of that sort. It is, as the scientists say, too early in the proposed investigation to predict results with any degree of certainty. It is much too early to lay down laws of limitation.

But are we wholly confined to such antecedent probabilities as these? Are there no arguments to be had from example?

A hundred of them, a thousand, dear reader! Throughout the countless ages of the past, women used to do all the things we now think she ought not to do; and she has managed, somehow, to retain her womanliness. Many of the industries now claimed as masculine were originally feminine. Who was it that originally did all the spinning and weaving, which is now done by the big factories? Who did all the dyeing, embroidering, bleaching, sewing—all the things, in short, that go to transform fibres into wearable fabrics? Who used to feed the traveller? Who prepared all the food? Who even tilled the fields, and cared for the crops?

But these occupations, you protest, are still recognized as belonging to women—perhaps not spinning and weaving, and tilling the fields, but certainly sewing and cooking. Softly, softly! These things are now only recognized as hers within certain narrow limits. We will consider those limits presently. Meanwhile, let me ask you, if you take away from modern industrial life all activities relating to the preparation of food and clothing, have you not taken out an enormous slice? The packing-houses, the refrigerator-cars, the canning-factories; the grist-mills, the grain elevators; the reapers and binders; the factories in which these are made; the railroads which transport them; the ships, the barns, the warehouses; the herds of cattle, droves of pigs, flocks of sheep; the poultry-yards; egg-case factories; ice-warehouses; the woollen-mills, silk, cotton, and linen mills; cotton-fields, cotton-gins, mulberry-groves, flax-fields, dye-houses, schools of design, looms; tanneries, shoe-factories, knitting-factories, wholesale and retail stores—oh, the list is too long for Walt Whitman! These activities belong to those industries which were originally woman's, and which did not at all prevent her from being a woman.

Conditions have changed—true; but they have changed for the better. It is easier to plough a field with a modern steam-plough, or

even a horse-plough, than it is by hand and pushing power of body, yet women used to do it in that hard way—in some countries they do it yet, hitched up with a dog for yoke-fellow. It is easier to run a steam-loom than to throw the shuttle by hand and swing the treadles by thrust of foot. Yet women used to do it in the harder way. It is easier to do all these things than it used to be, and yet women are no longer thought fit for the work. Why? Nothing seems to have altered unless it is the size of the operations.

That this is the true ground for the distinction that is now sought to be made, a few instances will show. When tailoring was done on a small scale, in a little shop, there were many women tailors: as soon as it became a recognized business, well organized and lucrative, women tailors were crowded out. Wholesale milliners are mostly men; retail milliners, women. Women knit stockings by hand and tend the knitting-machines; but men own and administer the knitting factories. Garment-making is now a vast, for the most part badly organized, industry. Women and men side by side run the machines and do the work; but men own the big factories and sustain the sweating system. The dressmaking division of it is in a transition stage, and changes may now be seen taking place. The dressmaker who goes out by the day is not yet an extinct species, and there are "Madames" who command high prices and have well-attended parlors. But the making of cloaks and suits to order, and selling them ready-made, is an industry that pays well, that is growing rapidly, and that is almost entirely, except as to the details of manufacture, in the hands of men.

It may possibly be that women have a special aptitude for cherishing the beginnings of things—a sort of industrial motherhood; and this, rather than man's tendency to grab a good thing for himself as soon as he sees it is good, may be the explanation of the above facts.

We are trying to be fair; but it bothers us to remember, just here, the undue importance attached to the comparative measurements of the brains of men and women. The average brain of women, it is said, is below the average brain of men as to size. The conclusion drawn is that women, with their little brains, ought to be content with the little jobs. But we suggest that this conclusion is at once too sweeping and too partial. A fairer rule would be that every woman with a head, say, twenty-two inches in

circumference, should be admitted to a full share in all public and economic affairs, and that all men with a smaller head should be debarred from large enterprises, and not allowed to vote.

Nor would it be a bit more absurd to do so, than to insist upon choosing workers by sex instead of by individual fitness. When we are not talking generalities we see this. We are able to perceive, for instance, that when we want a good dinner cooked to order, it is not wise to demand that it should be cooked by a woman—just any woman, so long as she is a woman,—while a French *chef* offers his manly services in vain. Or, being desirous of buying a piece of property, it is not likely that any of us would refuse to buy one that suited him in all other particulars, just because the owner was a woman, and, being a woman, unfitted, in his opinion, to transact large and important business.

Thus do we progress in practice beyond the limits of our narrow theory. And, in truth, in the matter of industrial division we have progressed far beyond our theories. That which we deprecate is already taking place, to a much greater degree than we recognize. And I think it is developing as we might suppose it would if the guess recorded above was correct. Many industries already show their dual nature. Some of them belong plainly to both sexes; some of them divide into two halves, a masculine and a feminine. For a conspicuous instance, we have the medical profession. Not only are there women doctors, with their special field of operation, but we have the twin—or, rather, the espoused—profession of trained nursing. The ministerial profession is reinforced by that of Sunday-school teaching, in which women predominate. The army, that most exclusively masculine of all organizations, now has its Red Cross, and even the Grand Army of the Republic has its Woman's Relief Corps. In the profession of teaching, there is still debate about the advisability of putting women into positions requiring much executive power; but there is no debate about the fitness of women for kindergarten and primary work. All modern penitentiaries have their women officers, many jails their police matrons, all reforms their women officers and active workers. Public institutions in which women are confined—asylums, poor-houses and hospitals—are officered by women as well as men, and the functions are well differentiated. No cosmopolitan journal can get along without its staff of women writers, whose work, while it sometimes overlaps that of the men,

is for the most part of quite another character. Women occupy all the fields of art; and, while in those fields their work is not so different from that of men as to justify a clear division-line, certainly not so different as to justify the division into inferior and superior, which is often rashly attempted, yet it is subtly different. One might say that it was broadly human, and delicately feminine. When our experiment has reached a more advanced stage, who shall say what interestingly complex divisions may not make their appearance? What Matthew Arnold calls "the stream of tendency" is not yet wholly evident, the lines of force are not yet well defined; still we catch glimpses of an intricate pattern taking shape before us which puts to the blush our childish attempts to make up patterns for ourselves.

Our argument is further reinforced by the observation that, while women have been invading the fields of labor outside of the home, men have been invading the fields heretofore sacred to the women of the house. To this no one, least of all, any woman, is raising the least objection. We are cheerfully ready to acknowledge—sometimes even inclined to urge—that the home is at this moment languishing for want of masculine interest in its various problems. To be sure, men now run our laundries, cook our breakfast cereals, bring our groceries to the door, bake our bread wholesale, dress our meats, grind our grains, paper our walls, paint our woodwork, do our house-cleaning and sweeping by means of compressed air, run our furnaces, supply us with electricity, fetch water to our doors, and make themselves pretty useful generally. But we want more. We want them to take up the problem of dish-washing, and come into council with us on the servant-girl question. And, recognizing, as we do from our hearts, that we cannot carry on the house and the family all alone, although it is supposed to be our peculiar sphere, it naturally occurs to us that what is usually supposed to be man's peculiar sphere may likewise be suffering for lack of us.

As for childless homes, are they really the fault of women in business? It seems to me that I have heard of men who did not like large families; did not want their wives preoccupied and anxious about the children; did not want to have so many mouths to fill, so many persons to support. It is possible that homes may be found here and there where the wives are not engaged in any business, not even the business of housekeeping, and where yet

there are no children. I know of other homes wherein the women are happy and busy, earning money for themselves and others, where there are self-reliant, unexacting children who like the arrangement. The truth is, this question depends upon other things than the employment or non-employment of women.

To be sure, the woman of the olden times who was shut up to the strictly domestic life of the harem, her only road to honor and consideration lying through the bearing of male children, desired children more intensely than women do now, being ready to run the risk of having several girls on the bare chance of having a single boy. But that was an artificial heightening and perverting of the instinct of maternity. It is an outworn method, and will not work to-day. The modern woman distinctly refuses to be driven into child-bearing by any weapon whatever. This question she claims the right to settle for herself. If she is going to be a heroine and face death to bring forth life, she righteously demands that she shall do so in freedom; that she shall be allowed the strength and uplift of doing it, consciously, from the highest motives. To bear children under threat would deprive women of the dignity and honor of their high office, and deprive the children themselves of a right beginning. Whether the force exerted to move them from this position be economical, or whether it consist in a simple narrowing of life to that one issue, it is nevertheless compulsion, and, in the opinion of every woman, violation.

There is a similar answer to be made to the charge that divorce is more frequent in proportion as women gain financial independence. It has been pointed out more than once, and I need not dwell upon it here, that the higher the ideal of marriage the less a woman desires to enter upon it, or to remain in it, for financial reasons. Divorces are actually precipitated by the bitterness with which a high-spirited woman resents her economic dependence upon a man whom, perhaps, she no longer loves, or who no longer loves her, or, indeed, upon a man whom she loves too well to be willing to burden. One may well ask whether a divorce got because a woman refused longer to endure a loveless or ill-assorted marriage, was not more righteous than such a marriage endured for the sake of the money it afforded.

All these things go to show that, instead of the business world suffering from the advent of women, it is the home that is suffering from the age-long defection of men. If it is true that

every occupation has its masculine side and its feminine side, then it is true of the domestic occupations as well as of those belonging to the world of business; and it is evident that the home will suffer from an undue predominance of one element over the other. That our homes are not running smoothly, that flats and boarding-houses multiply, and divorces, and nervous prostrations, instead of proving that women ought to stay at home and set things right, may well mean that women need the fresher aid and wider spaces of the business world, the relief of doing things on a big scale, the calming effect of working impersonally. Business hours may be—and I think are—unnecessarily hard for a woman, but at home she has no hours at all. Her work, as the old saw has it, is "never done." I met a young woman recently who said that she had never known good health until she went to work in a down-town office, and was obliged to keep regular hours. And if, in addition to the training in regularity and method which a business career gives a woman, and the freedom which her own income gives her, is added the influence which an active interest in his own home gives a man, we may hope for better homes, less full of fussy details, better ordered, reflecting on a small scale that flexibility and at the same time definiteness of organization which characterize modern industrial concerns. We shall not only have wives and mothers in these homes, but husbands and fathers.

If there is any human occupation which obviously has its masculine and feminine side, it is this business of making homes and rearing children. A woman can make a good imitation home all alone—better than a man can; but she cannot make a real one, and no one knows it better than she does. Nor can she do it with only her husband's money to help her: she needs himself—his love, his special form of thought, his interest, and his presence. Nor can any children be brought up as they should be by only a mother, despite the panegyrics which have spurred her on to almost superhuman efforts.

Some day, let us hope, this struggling and sentimental old world will have arrived at an equilibrium of justice between the sexes; will have discovered, for one thing, the glories of fatherhood; will have linked the little place of rest and shelter and beginnings which we call "the home" with the big world of men and women, which is, after all, only the home of the adult, industrious human spirit.

MARION FOSTER WASHBURNE.

THE REFORM OF THE CALENDAR.

BY CHARLES HARVEY GENUNG.

"The heavens, in growing old, bow themselves down nearer to us, and put us to an uncertainty even of days and months."

MONTAIGNE.

THE period of eight years which elapsed between the 29th day of February, 1896, and the 29th of February, 1904, occupies a peculiar position in the history of our calendar. Although upon reflection all of us will recall the fact, to many of us it will come somewhat with the shock of a surprise to learn, that this eight-year interval without an intercalary day has occurred only once before in England, and only twice before in the history of the world, and that it will not occur again for nearly two hundred years. It is, therefore, appropriate at this time to make a brief review of the struggle of almost four centuries which culminated in the reform of the calendar under Gregory XIII.

The controversy concerning the computation of Easter, which from the middle of the second century had filled the church with strife, reached an official decision at the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325. Easter was to be the first Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox, which in the year of the Council happened to fall on March 21st. When the Julian calendar was established in B.C. 46, the vernal equinox had fallen upon March 25th. Had the Nicene fathers learned the lesson of this recession of the equinox, they might have avoided one element of confusion; instead of that, they added another by adopting the Alexandrine lunar cycle of nineteen years, and upon these decrees the miraculous filling of the baptismal font set the seal of divine approval. When Julius Cæsar put an end to the confusions of the Roman calendar, he computed the mean length

of the tropical year at 365 days and six hours; he provided for this quadrennial surplusage of twenty-four hours by counting the sixth Calends of March (February 24th) twice in every fourth or "bissextile" year. But the mean length of the tropical year is 365 days, five hours, forty-eight minutes and forty-six seconds. The average annual error, therefore, of the Julian calendar was eleven minutes and fourteen seconds. Thus in every 128 years the error amounted to twenty-four hours, and caused the vernal equinox to fall one day earlier than the Nicene fathers had decreed. This was the solar error. Furthermore, the lunar cycle of nineteen years contained, according to the Julian reckoning, 6,939 days and eighteen hours, whereas the 235 synod months which constituted the lunar cycle actually contained 6,939 days and only sixteen hours, thirty-one minutes and forty-eight seconds. This discrepancy, amounting in 310 years to twenty-four hours, brought the new moon into the sky one day earlier than the golden number required. This was the lunar error. And as the centuries continued to roll up the seconds and the minutes into days, the people became puzzled, the clergy began to make excuses, and the astronomers at last demanded a reform.

The lesser error was naturally noticed first. Although it required 310 years for the lunar error to make the difference of one day, while the solar error in the same period amounted to nearly two days and a half, yet the date of the equinox is not obvious to the people generally, whereas the appearance of the new moon by so much as one day too soon could not fail to attract universal attention. Gregory of Tours had commented upon this phenomenon; but remembering the baptismal font at Nicæa,

"This ilke monk leet olde thinges pace,"

confident that, in God's good time, the heavenly bodies would readjust themselves to the Nicene decrees. The Venerable Bede, observing that the new moon due on April 4th had prematurely appeared on April 2nd, likewise took refuge in the baptismal font; and Alcuin answered a troubled inquiry from Charlemagne in a similar strain. But Master Conrad, writing about the year 1200, when the lunar error had reached nearly three days, was not content to beg the question; he explained it. The sun, moon and stars, he said, God made on the fourth day, but Adam

was not created until the sixth; the moon was three days old when Adam saw it first, and he naturally assumed that what he saw was the new moon,—it was certainly new to him,—and in this pardonable misapprehension it was proper that his descendants should piously follow him.

The first important step in the direction of reform must be credited to the Scotch monk, Halifax, or Sacro Bosco, who in 1232 wrote a compendium of chronology, based upon the standard work of Bede. This compendium is noteworthy in two particulars: The ecclesiastical computation was, for the first time, subjected to an empirical test; and, for the first time, a modification of the Julian calendar was proposed and advocated. This was exactly 350 years before the promulgation of the Gregorian reform. Halifax corrected the Julian year by five minutes, thus rendering necessary the excision of one day in precisely 288 years. This is very close to the 300 year period of the Ptolemaic tables. He noticed also the lunar error; but, checked by his reverence for the Nicene Council, he admonished his readers to tolerate the faulty cycle of the golden number. He did not allude to its disastrous consequences in the Easter computation. These were first pointed out by Johannes Campanus, the chaplain of Urban IV., in his "*Computus Major.*" It is evident that even a slight error in the determination, either of the vernal equinox, or of the full moon thereafter, might make a maximum difference of five weeks in the date of Easter. In 1356 it did so. This possibility Campanus correctly demonstrated, and in so doing he touched the vital point of the reform, around which the fires of theological hatred raged for three centuries, till all Europe was divided into two hostile camps, each reckoning time by different days, and engaging in bloody encounters with reference to the resurrection of the Prince of Peace.

In the course of the thirteenth century, a knowledge of Arabian science began to spread through Europe. Campanus cited Albategni, who fixed the amount of the solar error at one day in one hundred years; he also advocated the thirty-year lunar cycle, which was likewise derived from the Arabs. From Roger Bacon, however, came the first emphatic protest against the confusion into which the calendar had been allowed to fall, and the boldness of his tone derives additional significance from the fact that his protest was addressed to Clement IV. He insisted upon

a modification of the Julian calendar; advocated the Arabian thirty-year lunar cycle; and came very near the truth by calculating the solar error at one day in one hundred and twenty-five years. He pointed out that in 1267 Easter was celebrated one week too late; and it pained him to reflect that, though fasting throughout the week of rejoicing, all Christendom had partaken of meat during Holy Week. He showed that Leo I. and Hilarius had raised objections to the Nicene rule, which was, therefore, regarded not even by the Popes themselves as an article of faith; he concluded with an ardent appeal to Clement to inaugurate "one of the greatest and most splendid reforms ever wrought in the church of Christ!"

This was the age of Dante. It was to be expected that the poet, who seems to have overlooked no fact or phase of his time, would make some allusion to the faulty calendar. In "Paradiso," canto xxvii., we read: "But ere January be all unwintered by that hundredth part down there neglected." Dante evidently had Albategni and the Arabian astronomy in mind, according to which, as we have seen, the annual solar error was the hundredth part of a day. Thus, nine thousand years would suffice to take January entirely out of the list of winter months.

The thirteenth century is further remarkable for an event of the utmost importance to the cause of the reform. Alfonso the Wise, of Castile, himself a proficient mathematician, was irritated by the defects in the current mode of reckoning; he is reported to have offended the pious by saying that, had he been present at the creation, he should have given God good advice. In 1248, this prince summoned a college of astronomers to correct the Ptolemaic tables. Fifty of the most celebrated mathematicians of the time assembled in the city of Toledo; and, in 1252, the same year in which Alfonso came to the throne, the new tables, still known as the Alfonsine, were completed. The mean length of the tropical year was fixed at 365 days, five hours, forty-nine minutes and sixteen seconds. Modern astronomy, with its multiplied facilities and its knowledge advanced by 650 years of study, observation and discovery, has been able to detect in this computation an error of only half a minute.

The contributions of the fourteenth century were few and futile. Clement VI. endeavored to elicit from his mathematicians some exact and feasible suggestion for carrying out the reform,

but they fell to playing schoolmen's tricks with the golden number, and left the problem unsolved and unadvanced. In the fifteenth century, however, the demand for a correction of the calendar became so urgent that it seemed for a time that the agitation was about to pass from words to deeds. Petrus de Alliaco, the distinguished Pierre d'Ailly of the University of Paris, appealed to John XXIII. With epigrammatic antithesis, he called the Pope's attention to the number and eminence of the men who had occupied themselves "*de dierum ac momentorum calculatione,*" instead of "*de denariorum ac monetarum computatione,*" and he was solemnly impressive concerning the sinfulness of continuing to celebrate Easter on the wrong day. The Pope promised to act as soon as the schism in the church should be settled; but, as this was accomplished by his own degradation from office, nothing came of the promise. Pierre's efforts at the Council of Constance were equally fruitless; it was more to the point that Jerome of Prague and John Huss should be burned than that the calendar should be reformed.

Meanwhile the people were obliged to help themselves, as best they could, from actual observation. The errors of the ecclesiastical reckoning exposed the Christians to the ridicule of infidels, and brought the church into intellectual discredit. It was feared, too, that through disregard of the lunar error the new moon might chance to fall on Good Friday; this brought with it the possibility of an eclipse of the sun which would shake popular faith in the miraculous nature of the darkness that covered the earth at the crucifixion. Petitions, reciting these various grievances, were laid before the Council of Bâle in 1434; after much quarrelling it was decreed that seven days should be dropped from the month of May, 1439. The working out of this plan had been entrusted to Nicholas of Cusa, who was thus the first mathematician to come forward with a definite proposal to effect the desired change. He assumed the solar error to be one day in 150 years; the omission, therefore, of seven days would suffice to correct the calendar from the time of the Council of Nicæa.

It is proper to notice, at this point, a slip which is found in some of our books of reference. It is taken for granted that the advocates of reform sought to correct the calendar from the date of the birth of Christ. This was, indeed, several times pro-

posed; but, with the church, the essential point was to maintain the integrity of the Nicene Easter rule and bring the vernal equinox back to March 21st. Accordingly, when Gregory dropped ten days in 1582, he went back only to the year 325, precisely as Cusanus had done in 1434, though reckoning with a different estimate of error.

But Cusanus did not remain faithful to his task; he went over to the rival faction of Eugenius IV.; and the Council of Bâle, in order to avoid an additional cause of strife, abandoned the calendar reform. It is one of the little ironies of history that this should have been made the reason for postponing a reform which was subsequently proclaimed in the midst of the greatest schism that ever rent the church, and which did materially increase the bitterness of the struggle between the Protestant north and the papacy.

In the latter half of the fifteenth century, another effort was made. Regiomontanus, the famous German mathematician, had constructed a calendar in which, by setting down both the ecclesiastical date and the true date of Easter, he endeavored to forestall the ridicule of the Jews and infidels; at least, they should not be able to say that the Christians did not *know* any better.

Regiomontanus was thereupon summoned to Rome by Sixtus IV. to aid in rectifying the calendar. That was in 1476, and in the same year Regiomontanus died. The reform was postponed for another hundred years.

The next step in the weary process was taken by Leo X., who appealed to the universities of Europe. Their reports were laid before the Lateran Council. In the foreground of the discussion stood Paul of Middelburg. His bid for popular approval was most quaint. According to his plan, he said, Easter would never fall later than the seventh of April and might arrive as early as the first of March; Lent would thus occur in a season when the days would be shorter and the unpleasantness of fasting be thereby mitigated. The delays and deliberations, however, seem finally to have disgusted the Pope; for, in the report which he authorized of the acts of the Lateran Council, the matter of the calendar is not alluded to by a single word.

At last, in the Council of Trent, we catch a glimpse of the the goal, though so disguised as to be unrecognizable. The Council came to an end without mentioning the calendar in any

official acts; only at the last session, in 1563, it authorized the Pope to revise the missal and the breviary. This was all. Fifteen years later, Gregory XIII., liberally construing his commission concerning the breviary as including the calendar, took the matter so vigorously in hand that within five years the Gregorian calendar was established in all the countries that acknowledged the authority of Rome.

Aloisio (or, as Ranke prefers, Luigi) Lilio, a Calabrian physician, whose name must be numbered among the immortals, had labored to construct a cycle which, while harmonizing with the conditions of the past, should yet be self-renewing for the future. He accomplished this in ten years, and died. In 1577, his brother took the manuscript to the Pope, who submitted it to the mathematicians. A commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Cardinal Sirleto; Christopher Clavius was its leading spirit. An abstract of Lilio's plan was sent to the Christian princes and the leading universities; the official replies are preserved at the Vatican. Dr. Kaltenbrunner, of Graz, whose scholarly paper on "*Die Vorgeschichte der Gregorianischen Kalenderreform*" must be the starting-point for every student of this subject, has made an analysis of these documents. They must have been dreary reading, but some points of general interest appear. Most of the reports were unfavorable. From the Bishop of Glandeves came the sensible suggestion, as from Petrus Pitatus of Verona forty years before, to drop thirteen instead of ten days, and so go back to the time of Christ. The opposition of the Protestants, he rightly thought, would be thus in a measure forestalled. The University of Vienna also advocated the plan. By this means, however, the vernal equinox would have been restored to the twenty-fifth of March as it was in the time of Cæsar; this would have been in contravention of the Nicene decrees. The few reports that were favorable to the plans submitted by the papal commission betrayed a total inability to deal with the question. One from Genoa thought ten days too much to drop at once, proposed seven instead, and suggested that Gregory's mathematicians get rid of the other three days "*in some other way*"! But from Paris came the most remarkable document. The faculty of the university spoke with a deep sense of its duties towards a world swarming with heretics, among whom it classed all astronomers: any attempt to reform the

calendar was an admission that the Holy Spirit had led the church into error and, by implication, that all who had believed in the Julian calendar would be damned. Thus spoke the Sorbonne at the end of the sixteenth century! With no encouragement from without, and with much opposition from within, the Pope and his commissioners are entitled to the greater credit for the steadfastness with which they pursued their purpose and achieved it. On February 24th, 1581-1582, Gregory XIII. issued the famous bull "*Inter Gravissimas.*" A medal was struck in commemoration of the event, but without mention of Lilio. The head of the Pope was on the obverse; on the reverse appeared the ram with the floral wreath as the symbol of Spring, surrounded by the serpent swallowing its tail as the symbol of eternity; the motto read: "*Anno Restituto MDLXXXII.*"

The Gregorian calendar is based upon the work of Lilio. It might with almost equal justice bear his name, although his plan underwent modifications. Copernicus had corrected the length of the tropical year by four seconds, and the Prutenian tables were substituted for the Alfonsine. It was decreed that "the eclipse of ten days," as Montaigne called it, should take place in October, 1582. The future was provided for, as we were reminded by our recent experience in 1900, by dropping the intercalary days from three out of every four centenary years, a mode of correction which Petrus Pitatus had proposed as early as 1539. With the twenty-ninth of February, 1904, we entered upon a series of leap-years which will not be interrupted until the last year of the twenty-first century. The epacts in the new calendar preserved the same relations as in the old, but they had a new significance: whereas formerly it was the age of the moon on March 22d that was indicated, now it is the age of the moon on January 1st. Thus in Catholic countries the year 1582 lost eighty of its full complement of days, for on the first of January the year 1583 usurped its place. The advantages of the new plan become apparent, when we consider the thirty artificial but ingenious tables by which the modes of correcting the lunar and the solar error are made to harmonize. In the year 2100, these errors will balance each other; the golden number will then agree with the Gregorian Epacts.

The Nicene fathers had not made their Easter rule a canon; to the bull "*Inter Gravissimas,*" however, obedience was exacted

on pain of excommunication. All Catholics, therefore, were obliged to adopt the reform. In Spain, Portugal, and part of Italy the new calendar was introduced on the day specified, Thursday, October fourth, 1582; the next day was October fifteenth, which would have been Monday, but thus became Friday. In France the change was effected two months later from December ninth to December twentieth. Belgium and the Catholic cantons of Switzerland followed suit in 1583, Poland in 1586, and Hungary in 1587.

In Protestant countries the case was very different. Unfortunately, the Pope made no diplomatic efforts to coax the Protestants into acceptance of the changes; on the contrary, he made the reform distasteful and humiliating to them by his ruthless high-handedness. Felix Strieve, in the "Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences," is authority for most of the details relating to the "*Kalenderstreit*" in Germany. It is his belief that the Pope intended to take the world by surprise, secure the adherence of the Protestants before they quite understood that the reform was due solely to the exigencies of the church, and in this way maintain the papal prestige at the head of an undivided Christendom. He promulgated the bull promptly without waiting for the "scientific justification." The retention of March twenty-first as the date of the vernal equinox plainly betrayed the ecclesiastical nature of the measure; the solar reckoning was thus kept in conformity to the Nicene rule, although it is amusing to note in passing that, in computing the lunar cycle, this rule was violated without compunction. The various arguments adduced by Clavius in support of the reform were, for an astronomer, mere stupid trifling: Christmas should continue to be midwinter, St. John's Day, midsummer, and the days of the greatest martyrs, who for the most part had suffered prior to the Council of Nicæa, would remain more nearly correct, and much else of similar weight. There was, however, one really practical reason for keeping the vernal equinox at March twenty-first; Clavius only dimly hints at it. That reason was that any change in the date of the vernal equinox would render all missals and breviaries useless, thus causing widespread inconvenience and entailing vast expense. Everywhere the needs of the church were to the fore; the Protestants grew suspicious and cautious. Nevertheless, it is possible that by the exercise of a little tact their acceptance

might have been obtained, if only for the sake of uniformity and a more nearly accurate time reckoning. The Reichstag of the Holy Roman Empire had already been summoned when the bull was issued. It assembled early in July. Not until September, however, did the Pope ask the Emperor to introduce the reformed calendar into Germany. This Rudolf II. could have done by imperial edict, and by omitting all reference to the Pope he might have succeeded in establishing the reform. The Duke of Bavaria had already ordered the adoption of the calendar in his realms, but this seemed to Rudolf an infringement of the Imperial prerogative and the order was withdrawn; moreover, the Reichstag, always jealous of its rights, was in session. The outcome of the situation was that, at the instigation of the Pope, the Emperor requested reports from all of the Electoral Princes. The Landgrave of Hesse, who had some reputation as an astronomer, emphatically deprecated any papal intervention. Augustus of Saxony wrote even more vigorously to the same effect. But up to this time there had been practically no opposition from the Protestants; to them it was an astronomical question. Altogether, meaning to please the majority of the princes without antagonizing the people, Rudolf thought he might safely introduce the reform. When at last the storm broke the Emperor had gone too far to be able to retreat with dignity. In September, 1583, he proclaimed the new calendar without any reference to its ecclesiastical character and its papal origin; the necessity of conforming to the usage of other lands was, practically, the only argument advanced in support of the innovation.

But the proclamation came too late. The papal bull had come to the knowledge of Protestants generally. It was no longer an astronomical question. It became a matter of ecclesiastical politics, embittered by theological hatred. It was observed that the reform was expressly based upon an act of the Council of Trent, and of all councils the Tridentine was the most hateful to Protestants. The Catholics all obeyed the edict; the Protestants all refused to obey, except in principalities where they were in a hopeless minority; in Bohemia there was armed resistance; riots occurred in Riga when the first Sunday after the change was celebrated on Wednesday, and in Belgium there were similar troubles. The ten days were dropped out of January, 1584; but the Imperial courts had to reckon by both old and new styles.

It is no matter for wonder that the dropping of ten days should puzzle the common people. It is difficult for even the most lucid expounder to make clear to the untutored the difference between dropping ten days from a calendar and losing ten days out of time; that the sun and the moon and the stars move with inexorable precision, and only the human methods of measuring their movements are at fault; that a few seconds of error gathered up here and there out of the centuries will in time amount to one whole day which the human race has most assuredly lived, but which, in its infinitesimal fragments, the calendar failed to record. To the peasant mind this thought was incomprehensible. Ten days had been taken out of their lives, and the idea was highly disquieting that such a thing could be done by any enactment, whether papal or imperial. Vulgar, tasteless witticisms were everywhere rife. Even the intelligent indulged in cheap ridicule. Osiander maintained that the Pope should not be allowed to eat or drink for ten days, and furthermore advised him to conciliate at once the ten saints who lost a day of honor each, lest they bolt the gates of heaven against him and keep him waiting for ten days outside, where the devil might take him. The indignation of the peasants found expression in many vulgar little squibs and pamphlets. A "*Bauernklage*" in rhymed iambics appeared in 1584; the rhymester complained that nobody could tell when to plough, to sow, to dig herbs, etc.; why, even the birds did not know when to pair, to nest, to sing, and to fly south. Addressing the Pope, he said: "Thy God will certainly hold His last judgment upon thee ten days earlier." Of course, Protestant hatred of the Pope and of all his works embittered the controversy far more than mere peasant ignorance. The new calendar was the "Trojan Horse," and it must not be admitted into the evangelical churches. The pulpit fulminated in language which could not be printed to-day. The Pope was covered with shameful abuse. It was asserted that he wished to establish a monopoly in calendars, now that Luther had ruined his pardon and dispensation business. He wanted to set Germany by the ears, it was charged, in order to ascertain who were opposed to him, and then exterminate them in a second St. Bartholomew. The Protestants did not hesitate to lie, but still further inflamed the people by freely quoting passages from the papal bull which that document had never contained. Super-

stition was enlisted in the strife; the moon on the third of March presented to awed observers the countenance of a veiled woman, who bent low towards the troubled earth and cried: "Woe! woe!"

The Catholics, for the most part, wisely refrained from serious rejoinders. There were some cheap squibs, and in 1590 one Johann Rasch asserted that the birds paired consistently on St. Vincent's day: "Good Catholic birds, more reasonable than many a boorish addle pated man!" A certain nut-tree, too, afforded the Catholics some comfort; it had always remained leafless till St. John's Eve, but on the following day had put forth not only leaves, but blossoms; after 1582 this happened in strict accordance with the new calendar ten days earlier. Branches were sent to the Emperor and the Pope, and pilgrims flocked to see the miraculous tree. Similar stories abounded. From Transylvania came one of a physician whose gout, like an American's hay-fever, kept its annual appointment on a fixed date; from Christmas to Candlemas it plagued him, and in 1582 it piously adapted itself to the Gregorian calendar.

After all, the old calendar was quite as much the work of the hated church as was the new; but this the Protestants never seem to have taken into consideration. Only the most enlightened, like Tycho Brahe and Luther, urged the reform without regard to anything but public utility. Montaigne was perceptibly irritated by the innovation, although, of course, that calm and open-minded rationalist recognized the soundness of the astronomical argument. It made him feel old. "My imagination," he says, "in spite of my teeth, always pushes me ten days forward or backward, and is ever murmuring in my ears: 'his rule concerns those who are going to be.'" But again, reason dominating his rebellious imagination, he says: "There was no more error perceived in the old custom than there is amendment found in this alteration. So great an uncertainty there is throughout; so gross, obscure, and dull is our perception." But it is a curious thing that, even among the intelligent and learned Protestants, there were some, like Mästlin and that dilettante astronomer, the Landgrave of Hesse, who denied the need of any reform. The former, blinded by prejudice or made callous by custom, confidently asserted that, before the error could so increase as to throw the vernal equinox over to Christmas day, the whole world would have gone up in inextinguishable flames, with all its calendars

upon it. As Strieve points out, this belief in the near approach of the world's end was again widespread, and the phrase "in these, our last days" was very common. The year 1588 was set down for sounding the trumpets of judgment-day. In that year, there was to be a conjunction of all the planets which marks the close of one of the great astrological epochs. Others chose 1623 as the date of the world's end; but in either case the unexpired term of the earth's sentence was so short that a reform of the calendar did seem superfluous. Furthermore, Mästlin accused the Pope of caring as little about the end of the world as an "Epicurean scoffer," for he uses the words: *"Calendarium perpetuum."* But it was also Mästlin who put his finger on the really weak point of the Gregorian reform. He insisted that, if any, not ten, but thirteen days should be dropped. This was not a frivolous, but a logical objection. Our reckoning would then coincide with the actual Christian era. But the reform had advanced too far; after all, this was a point rather of historical than of fundamental importance; only the publishers of missals and breviaries could have derived any substantial advantage from a further change which would have affected the dates, but not the reckoning. Luther, who always made his points with small refinement, but with a certain brutal sanity which we call "horse-sense," maintained that the calendar should be reformed without regard either to the Pope or to Easter. At best, the Easter festival was a "wobbling feast," which he compared to an old coat, made worse by patching. The ancient law of Moses concerning the vernal equinox was the old coat; the patch was the rule of the church fathers concerning the "first Sunday thereafter." The purpose of this regulation was, of course, to prevent the coincidence of Easter with the Passover. "Hence," said Luther, in some such language as this, "hence this wobbling and everlasting haggling; let the '*Schuckelfest*' wobble on as it has for 1400 years, and let the princes reform the calendar by secular authority." But Rome controlled many lands and peoples, while secular authority was short-armed; and to the church the determination of Easter was, as we have seen, of the first importance and the real motive of the reform.

The failure of the Protestants to take the entirely reasonable stand of Luther increased the general bitterness of that turbulent time. The double celebration of holidays caused constant strife

and irritation. Catholics were haled to court and their children sent to school on what to them were holy days; where Catholic influence prevailed, quite naturally retaliatory measures were enforced. Business relations, too, became exasperatingly complicated, and this added fresh fuel to the already fierce fires of theological controversy. The action of the German evangelical bodies in 1699 did not greatly improve matters. At the instance of Leibnitz, it was resolved that, in the year 1700, the calendar should pass from February the eighteenth to March first. But the system adopted was astronomical, and would therefore coincide with the Gregorian reckoning only at intervals. It was not until the sane judgment, cold rationalism, and royal influence of Frederick the Great were thrown into the scale that at last the reformed calendar found universal acceptance in German lands. Denmark and the United Netherlands adopted it in the year 1700, and in 1701 the evangelical cantons of Switzerland followed, beginning the new century on January twelfth, for after the centenary year, 1700, eleven days had to be dropped.

In England a bill to inaugurate the reform had been introduced as early as 1585, but it never got beyond a second reading in the House of Lords. It was in 1752, in September, that the eleven days were finally dropped, and the legal year made to begin on the first of January. The riots to which this innovation gave rise are matters of familiar history. Hogarth's composition will be remembered, in which a Whig candidate is represented flattering the prejudices of the mob by displaying a banner on which is inscribed: "Give us our eleven days!" Sweden fell into line in 1753. Then, after this struggle of the centuries to get themselves correctly counted, only Russia remained, as she still remains, true to the errors of the Julian computation. By counting the year 1900 as a leap year, instead of dropping the intercalary day, as we did, their solar error now amounts to thirteen days. The matter has been taken in hand and, as of yore, complications have arisen at the outset. The Russian astronomers, fully aware of the beam in their Julian organ of vision, have nevertheless discovered the mote in the Gregorian eye. Accordingly, they ask the Western world to accept a new calendar which, Professor Glaszenap seriously assures us, will not need correction for 100,000 years. The advocates of this chronometric paragon must see that their course can only lead to a defeat of

all reform. Others, taking counsel of timidity, make this impracticable suggestion: the last day of each long month shall be dropped, so that in less than two years the Russian calendar will be brought into working accord with our own. This would bring confusion into all legal and financial relations on thirteen different occasions, instead of on one only.

The mote alluded to, which has darkened the counsels of the Russian Astronomical Society, is this: the three days of correction dropped out of every 400 years represent a rate of one day in each 133 1-3 years, whereas the error to be corrected amounts to one day in but little more than 128 years. Consequently, in the course of about 4000 years this error will avenge itself by throwing our reckoning one day out. It may be feasible then to consider the present Russian proposal; but, meanwhile, we may safely leave "*dies illa*" to be dealt with by the enlightened astronomers of that remote time.

CHARLES HARVEY GENUNG.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE WEST.

BY WILLIAM R. HARPER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

It is not uncommon to observe and to make remark upon the changes which have taken place in the world of higher education within the last ten or twenty years. Much has been said of the growth of institutions in numbers, scope and efficiency. Much has been said, likewise, of the modifications in the subject matter of the curriculum and in methods of work. We are led almost to believe that, not only in higher realms, but in the lower, education to-day is a wholly different matter from that of former times. For my own part, I am inclined to think that change, in so far as it has taken place, is, generally speaking, a matter of form rather than of essence. The result gained by education to-day is probably the same that our ancestors secured, whatever methods they employed. We have yet to learn, perhaps, that it is with education as with religion: access to heaven is no longer restricted, even by the most rigid sectarians, to a single path. It is important for educators to keep in mind that formal training is a thing of varied possibilities, and that for different individuals, of different temperament, of different geographical locality or different social environment, there may be different methods; and that, just as many roads led to Rome, in fact all of them, so there are many curricula and many schedules of work and many varieties of method to be counted and considered.

But there is one question, out of the great number connected with this subject of modification in educational work and of differentiation in educational policy, which, perhaps, deserves special mention. That question is this: Is there something in the Eastern institutions of higher education which is not to be

found in the Western, and is there something in the Western institutions which the Eastern do not have? Has the differentiation between East and West developed types of education which may in any respect be called different? We are not to forget, of course, that a large number of Western men are in Eastern institutions; and that a comparatively small number of students go from the East to the West. It is also true that in the faculties of Eastern institutions are many men who, by birth and spirit, are Western men. On the other hand, a still larger number of men in Western faculties are Eastern in their birth and education. I ought to add that my question has to do rather with college work and life than with university work and life.

Is Western college life more modern than the Eastern? So some maintain. Altogether too large a proportion of our college life and work is, perhaps, still mediæval in its character. Here belongs everything which suggests that the student has rights and privileges other than those of an ordinary citizen; that he is to be treated on a different basis, or that there shall be a different standard by which his actions shall be weighed. It is in accordance with this mediæval spirit that the incoming freshmen must be hazed, and that the police authorities are not to exercise control over a university campus; that a crowd of students may make themselves obnoxious in a theatre, or that men, because they are students, are privileged in the exercise of vandalism. Everything that would encourage the student to believe that he is a superior person, or a person of another caste, is a survival of mediævalism, and this spirit, many tell us, exists in Eastern colleges, large and small, to an extent practically unknown in the West. Moreover, according to mediæval custom, the members of a faculty were officers of state in authority over the students. Because of this relationship, there was always hostility between the faculty and the student body. The more modern idea makes the student and the professor brothers in the pursuit of knowledge, the younger brother guided by the older; both students, and both of them brothers. As a result of this fraternal relationship, a degree of intimacy exists between professor and student which was unknown in former years. It is maintained by many that this close relationship of student and instructor is much more common in the West than in the East. If now these two contentions can be made good, it might surely

be claimed that the ideas which control college life and work in the West are more modern than those which ordinarily prevail in the East. It may seem upon consideration that the mediæval presents a higher ideal than the modern. It is quite certain that, in the points just mentioned, as well as in others which might be presented by way of illustration, the mediæval is more attractive to the student himself. It is, undoubtedly, a source of gratification to feel that through the college one enters into the privileges of a special and higher caste; but this is not the modern democratic spirit; and, however fully the democratic spirit may be developed as among the members of the upper class, if that spirit is not manifest toward those outside of the class, it is a false rather than a true view of democracy which prevails.

Moreover, in so far as the feeling of the student body towards a faculty is simply that which those who are in supremacy themselves entertain toward a higher authority, and an authority which perhaps exercises more rigid surveillance than is needful, reserving rights which ordinarily might be assumed by the student body itself—in so far, I say, as the body of students acts upon the assumption that any privilege which they might secure, whether by fair means or foul, is theirs to enjoy, just to this extent is the relationship one which is characterized by the unfortunate and hurtful elements that once made up what we now call "mediævalism," a spirit distinctly opposed to that of modern progress.

Still further, the policy, which still prevails so largely in the Eastern college life, of placing men in one institution and women in another is unquestionably an ancient and not a modern policy. In this respect, the Western institutions, which are prevailingly coeducational, have made large advance upon the East. If anything in the development of educational policy has been worked out, it is that the present coeducational policy of the West is a stage of development higher and more advanced than the stage which is represented in the East by separate institutions for men and women. The spirit which opens the doors of every educational institution to women as well as to men is, if I may use a questionable phrase, splendidly modern in contrast with the older spirit of the monastery and the convent. Because I believe in the principle of evolution, at all events as applied to

educational progress, I am convinced that there is something still higher in educational policy in connection with this question of coeducation than has yet been reached; but the higher development will always include close relationship of men and women in college life, and the extension of equal privileges by the same institution to persons of both sexes. In all this, it may surely be maintained that the West is more modern than the East.

Is the spirit of the Western institution more natural and less artificial, perhaps, than that of the Eastern institution? It is possible that this is only putting what I have already said in another form. Surely, it is a more natural view of the situation, as well as a more modern view, that the student is to be treated as any other member of a civilized community, and accorded no special privileges because he is a student. It may also be claimed that the fraternal relationship between instructor and student is more natural than the relationship suggested by that of strict officialism. It may with equal force be said that the coeducational policy, as thus far developed, is a more natural policy and less artificial than that of education in separate institutions. But it is possible to go further, and to consider whether a more natural situation may not be found to exist in at least two other points. The life of the average student in the Western college is a more natural life, in that it is largely devoid of those artificial elements which connect themselves with the expenditure of large sums of money. It is the exception if a student in an institution west of New York and Pennsylvania spends eight hundred or a thousand dollars a year. It is probably an exception when a student in an Eastern institution, especially the larger institutions, spends a smaller sum than eight hundred to a thousand dollars. This single fact is an index of a different kind of life. It may not be argued that the Eastern student in spending more money gets a larger return; for this difference in amount expended represents the gratification of acquired tastes and the formation of artificial habits of life which are injurious to the extent in which they are artificial.

The relationship which has hitherto existed between institutions of college and university grades and secondary schools, including academies, appears to be another illustration of the acceptance of the artificial rather than the natural. To lay em-

phasis upon the examination method as a basis for entrance to college; to increase, from time to time, the requirements for admission; and to hold, as has been the practice until more recent times, the work of the college and the work of the secondary schools so definitely apart, the one from the other, is to lay emphasis upon an artificial distinction, a distinction which has neither a logical nor a pedagogical basis. Happily, the influence of the West in this particular is already manifesting itself very plainly in Eastern circles. Nothing has been more marked than the breaking down of the exclusiveness of the New England college and university. In so far as this exclusiveness continues, a greater artificiality may be claimed as existing in the East. Perhaps all this may be summed up in the statement that the Western institution is more democratic in the life of its students, in its relations to institutions of a lower grade, and, above all, in its relations to the public at large. This is, undoubtedly, due to the establishment of the State Universities, and the contribution of this class of institutions to the cause of higher education has been seen nowhere more clearly than in the tendency which is thereby prompted toward the breaking down of class distinctions. The influence of these institutions provided by the people and supported directly by public funds is very pronounced upon institutions built on private foundations. The establishment of a great State University, like that of Michigan, or Wisconsin, or Illinois, in the heart of New England would radically change the development of higher education in that region of our country. This larger democratic influence in the West represents most completely the proposition which I have tried to maintain, that higher education, in its various tendencies, has shown less of that which we may call "artificial" in the West than in the East.

This leads me to suggest still a third question. Is our higher education in the West more practical than that of the East? Much that I have already said might perhaps be included under this question, for that which is more modern and more natural may at the same time be thought more practical. By "practical" I do not mean "utilitarian," although this side of education must be considered at its full value. The work of the Western student is more practical in that he more frequently has in mind a definite purpose, something distinctly tangible. He is aiming to

accomplish something. Few students in a Western institution enter college simply because it is the fashion to take a college course, or because their fathers before them had passed through such a course, or in order to spend a few years which cannot easily be provided for in some better way. In other words, the Western student is in college because he appreciates the fact that the preparation which it furnishes will improve his opportunities in life. This does not mean that he selects only those subjects which bear upon the particular profession which he has chosen, although this may be done. It means, rather, that he is working toward a definite plan, controlled by a strong purpose to accomplish a certain thing, and further, that, in the large majority of instances, this purpose is being executed at a sacrifice either on the part of the student or on the part of those who support him. His point of view is different; and, consequently, a practical coloring pervades and penetrates his work. This same point is seen in another fact that institutions in the West have recognized earlier and more definitely, that the college training may be secured through the study of matters which stand in close touch with life, as well as through those subjects which are more remotely connected with it. The closer identification of professional training and college training is one of the great tendencies of modern times which has been more plainly emphasized in the West. The point I have in mind is illustrated by the fact that Harvard is to-day only beginning to introduce courses of instruction in technological subjects, and by that other fact, which, for a quarter of a century or more, has seemed a sort of enigma—the sharp line of distinction which has existed between Yale College and the Sheffield Scientific School. Here, again, the State Universities have been leaders; and their pioneer work, which was necessarily practical because of its close connection with the hearts of the people, has exercised in the past and is exercising in the present a tremendous influence upon higher education throughout the country, in demonstrating the possible efficiency of a more practical higher education.

My last question grows out of all the rest, and is again a summary of those that have preceded it. Is the student life and the student work of the Western institution more serious than that of the Eastern institution? To maintain this would, perhaps, be making an unjustifiable charge against the other institutions

from which have come the source of our strength; for who does not recognize the fact that it has been Harvard and Yale and Brown and Amherst and Williams, and a score of other names equally well known, that have given us in the West our ideals and our teachers? It is impossible for me to express a sentiment which would, in any way, reflect upon the past or the present greatness and efficiency of institutions that have contributed so greatly to the prosperity and welfare of our nation. But it is not I who raise this question. Within three months, seven college and university professors or presidents have in my hearing asked it. Ordinarily one might say that the answer must be affirmative, if what has already been said is true. If Western education is more modern, more natural and more practical, it ought to be more serious. Is it true, as the representatives of Eastern institutions themselves have said, that, in the larger and to some extent in the smaller colleges, it has ceased to be the proper thing, indeed the regular thing, for men to study? Is it true that a change has come over Eastern college life, and that to-day serious study on the part of the students is no longer a recognized part of college life, or that it is so inconsiderable a factor in that life as to occasion apprehension and alarm? Is it true that certain men well known in Eastern circles have given this question very careful attention, and are hoping for a solution, at least in part, to come out of the growing influence of Western higher education upon the East? I have heard these questions asked and answered affirmatively by representative Eastern educators; men whose candor was surpassed only by the intense anxiety which filled their souls upon this point.

Whatever may be said of the East, no man can yet say that in our Western institutions, through and through, there does not exist a spirit as serious as any that has characterized the student of any age or country; a spirit which poverty cannot repress; a spirit of devotion and consecration to life and to life's ideals than which no higher has been known in history. I have not suggested that this same spirit is not found in Eastern institutions. To do so would be to belie the truth as it is known to all men. I have simply repeated the question which Eastern educators are asking, whether the serious spirit does not prevail more extensively in the Western institution than in the Eastern.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

ANOTHER CANADIAN TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

BY JOHN CHARLTON, M.P.

THE scheme for another Canadian transcontinental railway, to be known as the Grand Trunk Pacific, is a bold one, and is one to which the Canadian Government now stands fully committed. The necessity for additional transportation facilities for the great Canadian Northwest is already quite apparent. Last year, there was a grain blockade of a serious character. It is reasonable to anticipate that the wheat production of the country will increase rapidly; and the Grand Trunk Pacific line cannot be fully completed in less than five years, by which time a great increase in wheat production will have taken place in the West; and the facilities to be offered by the new line will be fully required. One Canadian transcontinental line at present exists—the Canadian Pacific Railway, stretching from Montreal to Vancouver, with an extension to Quebec, and one across the northern part of the State of Maine to St. John, New Brunswick, and Halifax, Nova Scotia. In addition, a line known as the Canadian Northern is in operation, uniting Port Arthur on Lake Superior to Winnipeg, passing south of the Lake of the Woods, and for fifty miles through the territory of the State of Minnesota. This line has been extended several hundred miles west of Winnipeg, and is being pushed forward to Edmonton on the upper Saskatchewan. Both the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern rely mainly upon water transportation from Fort William and Port Arthur down the chain of Great Lakes, part of the grain transported from the West by these lakes going through to Buffalo and New York, part of it being transshipped at Depot Harbor on Georgian Bay for Canadian ports, and going by the Canada Atlantic and Grand Trunk to Montreal and Portland. The Cana-

dian Pacific Railway, as a through grain route, has not afforded extensive facilities east of Lake Superior, as the character of the line east of Port Arthur is not favorable to the conduct of heavy freight traffic.

The productive region of the Canadian Northwest is one of enormous extent, and the peculiar physical characteristics of this region have not been fully understood until within recent years. The isothermal line representing the mean temperature of St. Paul and Winnipeg passes northward of latitude 60°, and embraces the entire valley of the Peace River, of the Hay River north of Peace River, and of a portion of the Laird River valley. The Laird is a large stream entering the Mackenzie at about latitude 62°. An enormous region is embraced in the agricultural area of the Northwest, reaching up to near the south shore of Great Slave Lake, embracing the Province of Manitoba, and the Territories of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Athabasca, and a portion of British Columbia and Mackenzie. It is now supposed that the Peace River valley, which lies entirely north of the present settled section, is the best country in the Canadian Northwest. The future possibilities of this country, of course, are to some extent problematical. The area adapted to the growth of wheat in the entire Canadian Northwest is supposed to exceed 250,000,000 acres. Of this vast extent of country, but 3,250,000 are under wheat this year, and the anticipated harvest will be 60,000,000 bushels. The land to be placed under cultivation can easily exceed the present amount by at least thirty-fold.

Into this region a great tide of immigration is now flowing, from Great Britain, Northern Europe, and still more extensively from the Western States of the United States. The settlers from Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska and other Western States understand the conditions of the country into which they are going, and go prepared to commence farming operations at once, and with ample means to do so. The advantage of selling farms at from $75 to $100 an acre in these Western States and buying land just as good for from $5 to $15 per acre, is a sufficient inducement to insure a large immigration, now that the character of the new country is so well understood. That the country will settle up rapidly, and that its productive capacity will increase in corresponding ratio, may be assumed as certain.

To this great region railways are absolutely essential. The United States was furnished by nature with natural outlets, that rendered a large development of the country practicable before railways played any part in transportation. The Mississippi, with its thousands of miles of navigable tributaries; the Great Lakes, with the outlet from Buffalo to Albany by the Erie Canal; and the navigable rivers of the Atlantic seaboard, furnished transportation facilities adequate to the needs of the country for several decades. In 1850, when the nation had 23,000,000 inhabitants, railways had scarcely become a factor in transportation. The case is different with the Canadian Northwest. Its great river, the Mackenzie, with its tributaries, flows to the Arctic Ocean, and is not a practicable outlet for the products of the region it drains. Every bushel of grain must be transported through the interior of this country, and as far, at least, as to the waters of the Great Lakes, by railway; and, consequently, railway construction must to a large extent precede the settlement of the country. For this reason, the determination of the Canadian Government to secure the construction of another transcontinental line is timely and politic.

The new line will run from Moncton in New Brunswick to Port Simpson on the Pacific Ocean, nearly in latitude 55° and just to the south of the southern projection of the United States Alaskan possessions. Moncton is a convenient point for reaching the seaports of Halifax and St. John, being, by the Intercolonial Railway, 183 miles from the first-named place and 89 miles from the latter. From Moncton to Quebec, the line is to be laid down by the most direct available route, avoiding the territory of the State of Maine. The saving in distance between Moncton and Quebec is estimated at from 110 to 140 miles, as compared with the Intercolonial Railway. Better grades will be secured, and a line capable of moving freight at greatly reduced cost as compared with the Intercolonial will be the result. At Chaudiere Junction, five miles above Quebec, the line will cross the St. Lawrence by a magnificent bridge, now being constructed at a cost of $5,000,000. From Quebec, let the reader trace a line direct to Winnipeg passing north of Lake Nipigon, the most northerly body of water in the St. Lawrence basin, and connecting with Lake Superior by the Nipigon River. From Winnipeg the line will proceed to the Northwest by Battleford and Edmonton, striking the Peace

River at or near Fort Dunvegan in latitude 56°, and running from thence to Port Simpson either by the Peace River Pass or Pine River Pass, both of them highly favorable for railway construction, and less than 2,000 feet above the sea level. This route will make the main line from 1,835 to 1,875 miles in length from Moncton to Winnipeg, a little over 1,400 miles being the distance between Quebec and Winnipeg, and a line 1,740 miles in length, roughly speaking, from Winnipeg to Port Simpson. The construction of two important branch lines will unquestionably follow closely upon the construction of the main line; one from some point on the main line in the Province of Quebec running down the valley of Nottaway River, a large stream, draining what is represented to be a valley possessed of excellent soil and a climate that will permit the growth of cereals, and reaching James Bay, the southerly extremity of Hudson Bay, at the most southerly harbor, that will serve the purposes of commerce on that body of water. The other, a branch line from or near Dunvegan on Peace River, passing north through the region drained by Hay River and Liard River and on to the Yukon, a distance, roughly speaking, of 1,000 miles from Dunvegan to Dawson. The construction of these branches, of course, is not yet provided for; but their opening up will surely and immediately follow the construction of the main artery; and, in addition, branch lines will ramify through various sections of the Northwest, tributary to the main line.

The construction of this transcontinental line was perhaps unnecessary, viewed merely in the light of affording an outlet to the product of the Canadian Northwestern wheat-fields. An additional line to Lake Superior, whence grain would have found its way to the seaboard by American or Canadian routes, as the case might be, would have served the purpose. The Hill interest and other American railway interests would have penetrated the Canadian Northwest with railways, and offered ample facilities for moving the crops of the country by way of Duluth, Minneapolis and Chicago, without asking for Government aid. Sentiment has had much to do with the inception and perfection of the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme—a desire for commercial independence, for access to our own seaports, a desire to place ourselves in the position where the oft-repeated threat of the abrogation of the bonding privileges by the United States would cease to disturb us. For

these reasons, it was decided to have an all-Canadian line from ocean to ocean, starting from a Canadian port on the Pacific and crossing to the great Canadian port of Quebec, and to ports of the Maritime Provinces for a winter outlet. Perhaps we owe this scheme to the fact that the bonding privileges may be withdrawn, even though the injury would be as great to American interests as to our own.

The success of the new line east of Winnipeg will be largely a matter of grades. The discussion of this question has permitted me to impress again and again the importance of this question of grades upon the Government, and the promoters of this scheme. I have represented that, with a 4/10 per cent. grade, a good alline-ment, a ninety-pound rail, massive bridges and first-class construction, the road can carry wheat from Winnipeg to Quebec, and in winter to the Maritime Provinces, and compete with any other route; while if a road is constructed with light rail and fifty or sixty feet grades to the mile, we shall fail to secure the object had in view in constructing it. Fortunately, the country through which the new line will pass from Winnipeg east is favorable for the construction of such a line, which passes almost the entire distance north of the Height of Land between the waters of the St. Lawrence and the Hudson Bay basin, a country which is represented to be level and highly favorable to railway construction. If the anticipations with regard to this matter which seem to be rendered reasonable by explorations hitherto made, are borne out, this great trunk line will play an important part in future years in laying down the abounding products of the Canadian Northwest at the seaboard. The section of the new road from Winnipeg west will pass through a country where difficult engineering problems will not be numerous, and the line will be easily constructed. By the stipulations of the agreement between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, it is to be up to the standard of the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto, which is a first-class line.

Naturally, many theories were advanced as to the proper method to adopt in the construction of this great continental line. One party was in favor of Government ownership throughout. Among the advocates of this theory was the Hon. A. G. Blair, the Minister of Railways, who resigned ostensibly for the reason that his plan of construction was not adopted. Another party favored the con-

struction of a line from Quebec by way of North Bay near Lake Huron, and thence south of the Height of Land between the St. Lawrence and Hudson Bay basins, by granting aid in the form of subsidies in money and land. The Grand Trunk officials made overtures under this plan, and offered to construct the road for a subsidy of $6,400 per mile in money, and 5,000 acres in land per mile. The scheme of construction finally adopted by the Government was, first, to construct as a Government road the portion from Moncton to Winnipeg, say, 1,850 miles in length, and to lease this part of the line to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company for a period of fifty years for a rental of three per cent. a year upon the cost of construction, the road to revert to the Government at the end of fifty years, and the Government, for the first seven years after the road passed into the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific as lessee, to pay the interest upon cost of construction. For the western section, from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, the Company is to construct the road, the Government aiding by guaranteeing its bonds to the maximum extent of $13,000 per mile for the section from Winnipeg to the Mountains, and $30,000 per mile from the commencement of the Mountain Section to Port Simpson, the Government's guarantee not in any case to exceed three-fourths of the cost of the line without equipment. The remaining cost of the line is to be raised by the Grand Trunk Company of Canada guaranteeing the second mortgage of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. The Company is to issue $20,000,000 of preferred stock, and $25,000,000 of common stock. The preferred stock is to furnish $20,000,000 worth of rolling stock; the common stock provides elevators, yards, betterments of various kinds, terminal facilities, etc. The Government's security is, retention of ownership of the eastern division, with a mortgage upon the rolling stock placed upon the same by the Company, and a first mortgage on the western division with its rolling stock and appliances. The interest upon the guaranteed portion of the cost of the Mountain Section of the western division is to be paid by the Government for seven years, as in the case of the payments of the seven years' interest on the cost of the eastern division, which is estimated to cost from Moncton to Winnipeg, without equipment, $30,000 per mile. By this arrangement, the Government will pay in interest a sum estimated at $14,500,000, spread over seven years. This will represent the total amount of its aid to the scheme, aside

from that represented by advances for construction, for which it will hold the ownership of the eastern division and a first mortgage upon the western division.

The agreement between the Government and the Company contains various stipulations which will be greatly to the interest of the public. In the construction of the eastern division, the Company is interested in its being economically and honestly done as they are to pay interest by way of lease upon the cost, and the officers of the Company are to be associated with the commissioners of the Government in the management of construction. At the same time, the Government is interested in preventing the actual cost of the western division being misrepresented, as their guarantee is to be only three-fourths of its actual cost, and it has the privilege of auditing the Company's accounts and exercising the necessary degree of supervision. When the road is completed, the section from Winnipeg east is to be opened to the use of all railway companies which desire running rights upon the same, the provision for working out the details of this privilege to be arranged between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the companies seeking for running rights, the Government acting as arbitrator in cases of dispute, if such arise, as to the proper method of putting the system into operation. The same provision will also apply to the western division from Winnipeg to Port Simpson under the terms of the agreement. It is stipulated in the agreement that freight rates from the Canadian interior to Canadian seaports shall be no higher than to American seaports, and that export freight shall be carried to Canadian seaports, where not billed by the shipper to American seaports, and that no discrimination shall be used by the Company in favor of the American ports. The Company also enters into agreement to provide ample shipping accommodation at the Atlantic and Pacific terminal seaports. Another provision of great importance is that the Government shall, in its discretion, exercise control over the rates to be charged by the Company. Ample provisions are made against watering the stock. Rates will be applicable only to payment of dividends on actual cost, and, with the Government insisting upon reasonable dividends, the Company should perform its work very cheaply. The provisions of the agreement are very strict with regard to the up-keeping of the eastern division, which, at the expiration of fifty years, is to pass into the hands of the

Government in a thorough state of repair, and up to the standard of first-class roads at that time.

This great line, for 1,300 miles between Quebec and Winnipeg, will pass through an unbroken wilderness in the hinterland of Quebec and Ontario, and will serve the purpose of a great colonizing road, opening up to settlement an enormous region which is represented to be susceptible of sustaining a large population. It will develop the Athabasca and Peace River valleys in the Canadian Northwest and an important section of northern British Columbia, where extensive coal-fields have recently been discovered, and which is known to be rich in iron and in the precious metals. Its Hudson Bay branch down the valley of Nottaway River, when constructed, will make tributary to the road the business from the fisheries and the minerals on the shores of the great inland sea, which exceeds in size the German Ocean. On the eastern shores of this sea have been discovered enormous deposits of iron, and great mineral riches will no doubt be developed in the country around it. The branch line which will follow upon the construction of the western division, and run from the Peace River valley to the Yukon, will give the grain-fields of the Peace River valley cheap access to the mining settlements of the Yukon, which contains one of the richest gold-bearing regions in the world, and will give to the Canadian people a pleasing sense of being entirely independent, for their access to this region, of the American gateway at Skagway.

The sources of business for this great line are not confined to the transportation of grain from the productive lands that it will pass through from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains. It will have an enormous lumber trade, from the wilderness east of Winnipeg to the prairies of the West. It will also have a great timber trade, from the timbered portion of British Columbia, and of the Pacific Coast adjacent to Port Simpson, to the prairies. It will transport the cattle from the great cattle-ranches along the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains to Quebec or Halifax for shipment to Europe. It will confer upon the Northwestern portion of the great wheat-fields through which it will pass better access for grain to the markets of England, by way of Port Simpson and the Panama Canal, than can be offered by the long rail-haul to the Atlantic Coast. It will give a short and direct route for a great trade in flour and other products that is sure to spring

up between the wheat-growing region on the east coast of the Pacific, and the great population of China and Japan. It will give to Canada exclusive control of the vast and rapidly increasing trade in the valley of the Yukon, and in the auriferous region of Mackenzie and Yukon Territories. It will tap the untold resources, piscatorial, mineral, etc., of Canada's great *mare clausum,* Hudson Bay. It will prove a nation-builder, and the spirit of patriotism, and the determination to achieve an independent position as a commercial power, through direct and cheaper access to our own seaports, will inevitably give to the promoters of this scheme a reputation for far-sighted perception of coming events, and a bold grasp of the requirements of the approaching period of expansion and rapid development.

JOHN CHARLTON.

REMINISCENCES OF WAR.

BY CARMEN SYLVA, THE QUEEN OF ROUMANIA.

THE sun had set over Bucharest, casting a blood-red glow upon the broad city and the distant horizon, until the window-panes gleamed like fiery eyes. Then a softer hue overspread everything: the plateau deepened to violet, the heavens grew rosy-red, and the mist, packed with unhealthy malarial vapor, stole from the lower levels, and night at last rolled slowly over the whole country. The continuous, raucous groaning of the shells, which filled the spaces between Giurgewo and Rustchuk with tremors, died away. I stood on the little veranda, usually so sunny, where already many convalescents had basked in the autumn warmth, and awaited the fresh convoy of wounded, which had been announced, but had not yet arrived. At last the long-drawn, melancholy shriek of the engine broke the silence of the night, and the long train steamed slowly into the little station of Cotroceni, which I had turned into a refuge for the wounded on their way to the various other hospitals.

As far as was possible to one in haste, I selected for my care those whose wounds seemed to be the most severe, or whose condition needed most attention; but many dragged themselves along to implore that they might be taken too. I believe that they had a kind of superstition that my patients were more likely to be cured. In silence the solemn procession emerged from the darkness. The wounded men raised themselves in their beds to scan the new arrivals by the feeble and flickering light of the lamp which was always burning before the Ikon on the wall. A few, heavily groaning, lay still, and showed no interest: they did not even throw a glance towards the door. The surgeons moved from bed to bed changing the bandages; one of my ladies held a light, and I did what I could to encourage the nervous. They lay like tired

children, and groaned: "Oh! those carts, those carts!" For five days they had endured the jolting of the carts, and most of the wounds were in so terrible a state that we no longer used the word "gangrene," which the poor patients had learned to understand, but merely said in an undertone in French: "*Il y a du noir.*"

They told us what they had suffered from frost-bite, from the jolting on the road, from hunger and pain. There was one man only who uttered no sound. He made no complaint, told us nothing; in short, said not a single word. With eyes on the ground, he sat up on the edge of his bed and gnashed his teeth, which were invisible behind a dark beard. When his bandage was removed, we found a rather serious wound; one finger, half shot off, had gangrened, and was full of maggots and dirt. The surgeons shook their heads: "A strange wound," they said, half aloud. A jet of blood gushed out and spattered upon my dress. Half fainting he laid his head on my shoulder, and with clenched teeth kept praying us impatiently that his finger might be cut off. The surgeons had some difficulty in grasping the vein with their forceps and stopping the hemorrhage; his finger seemed to have been shot away from the inside of his hand. Trembling with cold, he repeated his entreaties. We endeavored to question him so far as his weakness and loss of blood might allow him to reply; but he gave no answer, turned his head away, kept his eyes on the floor, and gnashed his teeth. It was late at night before the last bandage was in place. Full of anxiety, I crossed over to the little summer-house, which, roughly improvised in an old ruined monastery, was bitterly cold in winter. The plateau of Cotroceni was dotted with myriads of Russian carters, who had come in ceaseless cavalcades from the furthest steppes of Russia, and who were never again to see their homes. There, graves were waiting them beneath the snow; with their horses and wagons they were to vanish from the face of the earth. Pariah-dogs and birds of prey were already gorging themselves upon the carcasses of horses, which lay where they had fallen, for no one could be spared to remove them. The barracks, now converted into hospitals, cast a bright line of light along the darkness, as I lay down for a few hours' rest. As a rule, I was up again before four o'clock, and then thought over and noted down the programme for the day.

Next morning I found the man with the wounded finger still sunk in the same gloomy silence, and with a still more sinister expression upon his face. Silent and shivering with cold, he sat on his bed, staring fixedly in front of him. I was accustomed to see the beautiful eyes of my Roumanians (" *les yeux dramatiques roumains,*" as a French surgeon called them) turned upon me with childlike confidence and joy, and I stood helpless before this expression of disconsolate torpidity. I could not stay long just then, and indeed did not return all that day, for we had improvised five hospitals in the town, and they all lacked every equipment save what was afforded by a little company of self-sacrificing, willing women, who procured the most necessary articles at the cost of their dearest possessions. It was no easy task, especially as there was then no " Red Cross " at all, and our hastily organized ambulance had nothing but what could be collected on the spur of the moment. It is only in time of war that the incredible insufficiency of common preparations becomes evident: what seemed at first a vast supply of beds and bandages is swallowed up in a couple of hours, and we stand helplessly facing dire necessity, with the danger of losing lives that might easily be saved but for the want of cleanliness and a little more linen. Were I to write a volume on this theme, I could not do justice to all that the women of Roumania did in those days of trial. Day and night they were to be found at their posts, giving all they had, whether they could spare it or no; yet they were not trained by any " Samaritan " hospital or by the Red Cross League. Many of these ladies, however, were accustomed to take the doctor's place on their own estates, where there was no medical assistance within miles. Besides, times such as these teach one in a few hours much that one did not know before. It is, as it were, a merciful dispensation of God that more mistakes are not made, and that one kind helper learns from another how things ought *not* to be done. People thought that I was most experienced; they had forgotten that I was already settled in Roumania at the time of the Franco-German War and that during the Bohemian Campaign I was living on the Rhine. In other words, I had been as far as possible from the theatres of war; so far, in fact, as to have been myself one of those simple people who, sending little, had flattered themselves they had sent enormous supplies. I took care not to tell the truth, however, for I had made minute inquiries and thought

to myself that, even if I should make mistakes, others make them also; we none of us knew anything. When one has not even got sufficient shirts for one single ward, no more bedding, no cots and no dressings, one may have ever so much knowledge and experience, and yet they will be of no avail! In peace, numbers convey no idea to our minds. In war alone one learns what one thousand, two thousand, four thousand wounded mean. The joy with which each fresh parcel is greeted should, indeed, reward the generous givers; and yet at the moment one has hardly time to thank them! Nowadays, there is far too much talk about the emancipation of women. The sex in this respect curiously fail to grasp the beautiful part which has been allotted them—the privilege of help! So much is needed that one may be able to help. So much intelligence, heart, foresight, experience, good-humor and self-sacrifice, that to learn to help takes a life-time. War, which we otherwise reckon as one of the greatest evils of humanity, has at least this use—it teaches self-forgetfulness, it brings one into touch with the heart and strength of a nation, it levels all differences of rank and class, and makes for the universal brotherhood of man. If only one kept the same ideal before one in time of peace, there would be no time then to think of emancipation for sheer pressure of work!

When I got home late that evening, one of the ladies, who was engaged in my hospital, told me that the curiously silent patient had asked urgently for me, and that, however much they had begged him to tell them what was troubling him, he had steadfastly refused to speak to any one except myself. They had hoped to get him to confess and ease his mind by summoning a priest, who placed his "cope" upon his head and said some prayers over him. It was in vain, and the poor fellow continually exclaimed: "The Princess! I will see the Princess! I will tell the Princess everything!" At last they told him that they could not find me just then, and that he must be patient until the morning.

On entering the ward the following morning, I could see from a distance how the bed was trembling beneath him. He tried to jump out of bed as soon as he saw me, but fell on his knees as the attendants prevented him. Putting his hands together, as though in prayer, he began to make a formal confession to me, at the same time gnashing his teeth so loudly and trembling so violently that the bed shook with his emotion. He was as yellow as wax; pyæmia

had already set in; and he glared about him with such a horror in his eyes that the sight of him filled me with fear and pity. "I! I! I did it!" he groaned, with trembling lips; "I thought of my mother; yes, I thought of my mother, and then the devil whispered to me: 'One shot, and you are wounded, and then they will send you home!' I did it and now I must die, now I am a suicide and lost to all eternity, in hell for all eternity! The devil whispered to me! Only the earth and my rifle know what I did, and now I am a coward and a suicide. Hell is grasping at me already! I feel it, I am consuming in its flames! Oh! forgive me, forgive me! Give me peace before hell gets hold of me!" I tried to speak gently to him of God's goodness and long-suffering, but he interrupted me: "You, your path will be strewn with flowers: for me there is only a merciless hell!" How long he was speaking I do not know. All the wounded were sitting up in their beds, listening, pale with terror; the surgeons, deeply moved, stood round this awful death-bed, where a luckless handsome youth, who perhaps had never done an evil deed till that particular moment, believed himself to be handed over to all the terrors of hell. The fire of the ague, which devoured his bones, he felt as the flames of hell, and his terror was such that one seemed to see the Pit opening its jaws before him.

In so terrible a scene, indifference was impossible. The chattering of his teeth and the broken words of that memorable confession could be heard throughout the ward. At last he grew so weak that they coaxed him to lie down, and he sank again into the same disconsolate silence. Only when he was asked how he felt, he replied: "Far better than I deserve: I am a miserable sinner!" On the third day we moved him to a tent, as we feared that the blood-poisoning might be infectious to the other patients, and his despair too harrowing to the emotions of the wounded. His patience remained unshaken to the last; but I did not feel that I had been successful in allaying his fears and bringing him consolation. Still, there was no further burst of emotion, however great his sufferings may have been, and he passed into eternity calmly and without a word.

The day after, a dense, heavy autumn mist enshrouded us, as with a curtain of icy lead. From the hospital windows one could hardly distinguish the nearest tents, when a poor woman, wading barefoot through the deep mud, emerged from the gray monotone

of the mist. She was accompanied by a man, apparently a neighbor from her village. I saw her talking to the soldiers of the Ambulance, but before I could reach her she had given the name of her son and was asking after him. Thoughtlessly the soldier replied: "He died last night in this very bed!" The poor woman fell upon her knees, as though she had been struck by lightning; the clean linen she had brought with her fell into the mud. Beating her breast, tearing at her veil and hair, she kept calling his name, "Radule! Radule! Radule! Radule!" out into the mist. She would not let herself be comforted, she declined both food and drink, and we barely succeeded in forcing on her companion some money for her use. She would not stay with us, but began her homeward journey without delay. I watched her figure in the mist loom larger and larger, and listened to her voice growing hoarser in the distance. So long as I live I shall hear the cry of that disconsolate mother's heart sounding in my ears: "Radule! Radule! Radule!"

In the ward, however, they had regained their spirits, for a lad lay there who was happy in a slight knowledge of the violin. We had got him a fiddle; and he lay on his bed with a happy smile, forgetful of the pains in his leg, and coaxed some little tune from his instrument, his pale lips shaping into the word "Sublime!" Every one was glad in his gladness, and no one thought of criticising his playing. Amongst the first batch of wounded was the only son of a well-to-do miller, a lad of about eighteen, who had been shot through the hand, and tetanus had set in. We made every endeavor to conquer the terrible and deadly cramp by rubbing and massaging his back. But all, of course, was in vain, and soon his pleasant childlike smile was changed to the tortured and distorted semblance of a grin. As he knew that he must die, I spoke some comforting words to him and said: "God is near to you, He will help you." "Yes, yes, do you not see?" he exclaimed; "I see Him." All night through he made the sign of the cross; and, as his strength failed him, he begged the lady on duty from between his clenched teeth: "Make—me—the cross!"

It was a pleasant hour in the wards when all the bandages had been changed and letters were dictated to those at home. We had allotted the duty of writing to the young girls, who were allowed to distribute the food, make cigarettes and write letters. One of the wounded had had its lower jaw so shot away that he could

hardly speak, and yet he dictated the following letter to his wife: "I hope this letter will find you as happy as can be. As regards myself, you must know that I am very well" (he was dying!) "and in the Princess's Hospital. I was shot through the breast." "But, Nicolai," interrupted the girl with a roguish glance, "you are telling lies; that isn't true at all!" "Do you think," said he, quite seriously, "that I would tell her what I look like, so that she may be unfaithful to me?" Another threatened his wife with the most terrible beating, should she commit herself in his absence.

One young man would by no means allow his leg to be amputated. "Have it done," said his comrade on the next bed, who had had his hand cut off the day before; "let them do it; it does not hurt!"

The convalescents performed complete comedies, which they made up for the amusement of those who were still in bed. These plays were often extremely funny and witty, representing scenes at the law courts or elections, and in performing them they used to develop a truly marvellous eloquence.

When the first body of Turks was expected, I went to the hospital and delivered a long speech, in which I explained to our wounded that prisoners of war and wounded are no longer enemies, but brothers. "Yes, yes," said one of them, "brothers; but if only I see the man who wounded me—" and a threatening fist completed the sentence. At eleven o'clock at night I drove alone in my sleigh through the wonderful moonlit night, and found the Turks being zealously cared for by our wounded, who were holding lights and basins for the surgeons as kindly as though they had never thought of looking for the men who had wounded them! They could not talk to one another, but as it is generally accepted that no words are wanted for making love or playing cards, they gambled all day long. The patience and gratitude of the Turks were indeed admirable. At first they were terribly frightened, because they had made short work of our prisoners, and so thought that the same fate would befall themselves. But when they saw that they were carefully looked after, their gratitude knew no bounds. I was present when a surgeon, after resetting a patient's elbow, put several tubes through the shattered joint. The Turk lay there with closed eyes and did not utter a sound; though his skin clung to his bones in agony, not an eyelash quivered, but when the surgeon had finished, he stroked his arm as if to thank

him with a gesture. When we asked them how they were getting on, the invariable answer, even to their last breath, was: "Better, well." The poor men suffered greatly from homesickness, especially at first. An Arab captive threw himself on the ground before me, and, kissing my feet, implored me to allow him to go home, at the same time showing me on his fingers that he had eight little children. I had to leave him unconsoled, for I could not even talk to him. He died of homesickness.

It was very interesting to observe the different ways in which the various races met their sufferings. The Turks were the most stoical, the Russians the most patient, the Roumanians showed a peculiar blending of humor and deep melancholy. They clamored almost incessantly for their mothers, whose hands they covered with kisses; whilst the prettiest of young wives would only be greeted with a short imperious nod after a separation of some months. The gypsies were the most sensitive and wept freely: these highly strung children of Indian dreamland, so full of mystery for us, are like creatures in a fairy-tale. Many a dying man greeted me as "mother" in those days.

Many an awful story, too, I had to listen to,—stories that cannot be compressed into so small a space, but here is one of them:

The autumn leaves are falling singly through the peaceful air of the garden of Goleschti. The sun lights them up again for the last time, and then, when they seem to be fullest of life, their hour of death has come. In the garden of Goleschti patriots have been brought to sacrifice their possessions, liberty, happiness and peace for their country. There lives the patriarchal family of Golesco, great-grandmother, grandmother, with splendid sons and daughters, and a great host of grandchildren. Peace reigns supreme just now in the garden of Goleschti. Under the linden-tree sits an old lady, dressed in black. A book lies on her lap, and her great light-brown eyes are piercing into the past, recalling all the forms of those to whom she has sacrificed her life, and whose death-beds she has soothed. She has never married; her countenance is sunken and ascetic, but of a great nobility and shining gentleness, such as one sees in Murillo's picture of St. Thomas. Her life is full of cares: she has educated the orphans of her brothers and sisters, taught the whole village the beautiful art of embroidery, encouraged to retain the tradition of the Roumanian national costume, which pleased me much when first I came among

them, and became a source of profit for the country. She is the guardian angel of the whole neighborhood. Just now she is giving herself a moment's rest; she is looking into the secrets of her tired heart, whilst her thoughts flutter down to the grave, as the dead leaves to the earth, both irradiated by the life-giving beams of the sun.

Now a sound catches her ear and she turns her head. A shade of deep compassion flits across her brow; for, through the quiet air, the sorrowing tones of the death chant, sung by a single voice, come tremblingly from the village street. It is the priest, moving slowly in his vestments between the mean huts, followed by his acolyte with the censer and a funeral procession, followed also by mourners, who often improvise most poetical *Bocete* like the *voceratrice* in Corsica. In a pine coffin on the bier lies an aged woman with snow-white hair, peaceful and calm, her brow furrowed with the burden of many bitter years. A moderate procession follows reverently and devoutly. Only one of the followers strays hither and thither, raises her finger to her temple in a military salute, smiles amiably at every one, showing her gleaming rows of teeth, whilst her wonderful brown eyes rest with indifference upon the body that she is honoring. It is Anita, the daughter of the dead woman, the mad girl who in losing her mother loses everything in her world, and yet is ignorant of it all. An old rag, scantily girt round her hips, serves her for drapery; her blouse is open and only now and again does a compassionate hand set straight her fluttering rags. Her black hair falls in disorder from under a kerchief which might once have been bright red. No one appears to be disturbed by her; she glides among them, now forward now backward, always with the military salute and the pleasant vacant smile. She is the only one who laughs at such a time. At last the church door is reached; but, whilst the procession vanishes through it, Anita remains outside for a while, playing round the mossy headstones, until she too disappears under the porch, enticed by the singing. The recluse in the garden looks after her with a sigh, and the story of the mad girl passes through her mind as, placing her slender finger between the leaves of her book, she paces silently up and down over the fallen leaves.

How pretty Anita was, how fresh and full of mirth! Her brown skin was warm as sun ripened fruit, her beautiful eyes gleamed

with exuberance of vitality and roguishness, and how ready was her reply when the boys teased her. One of them had tormented her more than the others; and, when he came in the evening and knocked at her window, she came out and sat with him on the bench every night.

Then came the war; and one sweltering day in August found him, her Mihai, gone. It was no use to cry. "And if I do not return?" he asked, and looked at her. "Then I, too, will die, Mihai!"

The cruel battle of Gravitza had passed, and he had sent news that he was alive and well. But no further tidings came. Anita watched the leaves fall and the heavy mists rise; then came the frost and snow, yet never a word reached her. At last, she could endure the anxiety no longer.

It was strictly forbidden for women to cross the Danube, but she found a means of evading the order. Hiring a wagon, she declared that she had transport service to perform and wandered to Plevna by the side of her little oxen. Carrying a bundle of clean linen for him, and a large melon on her head, and other fruits and bread in the bosom of her blouse, she passed through the camp, through the long trenches beneath the hail of the enemy's bullets, seeking her lover. Then, just at the moment when a man fell shot at her side, she heard that her Mihai had been wounded and carried to some unknown hospital. Pale and speechless, she stood in the icy water of the trenches. She did not even think of bending her head to escape from the bullets. "He got his feet frost-bitten here and a bullet in his shoulder," said one of his comrades; "but I do not know where they have taken him."

Turning away with a heart heavy as lead, she began to search the field hospitals, trembling at the miserable forms of the wounded who could not be moved. Her Mihai could not look like *that!* She was almost glad that she could not find him there. They told her that he would be in Metschka still; so to Metschka she went, barefooted, over the frozen ground, through the dense mist. He had been at Metschka, but had been moved further on to Turno Magurelli. But he was still alive; the bullet had been removed and half his foot taken off, but otherwise he was so far well. Anita wandered on to Turno Magurelli. The whole town had been transformed into a hospital. Going from one to another, she visited twenty hospitals in turn. At last she found out the one

where he had been; but he had again been moved four days before to Craiova. With a sigh she resumed her bundle and took the road afresh. But he was not to be found in Craiova; he had gone with yesterday's batch of wounded to Bucharest, for there was no more room at Craiova.

In Bucharest, she asked her way from door to door. Every large house, every barrack and many a school was a hospital. At last, at last, she came to Cotroceni and the barracks of the Rifle Battalion, and at length received the answer, "Yes, he is here," in reply to her inquiries. She begged to be allowed to see him, to nurse him, if she might, and hesitatingly entered between the long rows of beds, guided by a friendly nun who bore the badge of the Red Cross on her arm. A lady with the Red Cross came up to her and said: "Here he is, dear child: you will find him changed!"

Indeed, she could hardly recognize him. Her knees shook on seeing him so pale,—wasted away like an old man. And, when he smiled at her, his smile seemed like a grimace. Oh, God! how should she bear her sorrow before so many people! Like a statue she stood by his bedside day and night, without even a thought of resting after her long wanderings. They had to force her to take a little nourishment. Out in the open, endless convoys from the far interior of Russia passed along in the deep mud of the softened roads; convoys of wounded from the battle-fields, convoys of captured Turks, starving, barefoot on the ice; convoys of sick, victims to typhus and frost-bite, and half-starved horses which fell a prey to the dogs and crows. Their red and ragged ribs pointed to the heavens, now dark with snow. Presently snow began to fall, as though the compassionate clouds wished to cover the miseries of friend and foe with the same soft, warm covering. Anita saw nothing of all this. Her eyes were only for the face of her Mihai, who lay there so patiently despite his sufferings, and who, when they asked him how he felt, always replied with the same patient word: "*Bine.*" In a whisper he told her how they had cut away half his foot without giving him enough chloroform, and how terribly he had suffered. Then tears rolled down her cheeks, and that was balm to his heart. They told her he was saved, he would not die. Her heart trembled with such joy that she could not even speak. The first time she saw his wounds, her face turned as white as snow. They gave her a draught of wine, and told her that was nothing, it would soon be all right, and she

was to give him a spoonful of medicine to quiet him, if he seemed to be in great pain. He told her about Gravitza and showed her his decorations, though she could hardly bear to listen, so great was her terror. And yet she liked to hear his pale lips tell the story of his heroic deeds. Three bullets had passed through his cap without touching a hair of his head. "You see, if the dear God wills it, one has one's day!" he said. One night he was very unquiet, and bitterly complained of great pain in his shoulder and foot. "I was just going to be relieved, because my feet were frost-bitten after twenty-four hours in the trenches, and then the bullet came! Oh! can't you send me to sleep?"

Hastily seizing one of the medicine bottles in the uncertain light of the night lamp, she gave him a large spoonful and then stayed quite quiet so that he might get to sleep quickly. But he suddenly began to complain of pains in his stomach, and his face became distorted in the most terrible manner. The pains grew worse and worse, and he began to pant for breath. Greatly terrified, Anita awakened a nun who was dropping off to sleep on a wooden chair in the corner. She could not imagine what was the matter with him, and wanted to get some cloths warmed. But Anita, in her terror, ran and called the assistant surgeon to come at once, for God's sake, as Mihai was very ill. He looked at the patient and turned roughly to Anita: "What have you given him?" Anita pointed to the bottle. "My poor wretched child," he cried, "that is carbolic acid!" Anita stared at him as though she could not understand. "Is that very bad?" she whispered. "Bad? It is poison!" said the surgeon, and without troubling further about her, applied every conceivable remedy, but without success. The sick man was already in the throes of the most terrible death struggle. Anita held him in her arms, called him by his name, and prayed aloud. From time to time he made the sign of the cross, and not a word of reproach passed his lips. "And yet I never had my day, Anita," he said. As the dawn broke, he became very quiet and very heavy; and she sat quite still holding him in her arms without a word. She would not let him be taken from her until she was removed by force, that the body might be covered up and carried out. She followed them up to the door, and then, turning round, looked every one in the face and said, "Mihai." That was the only word she was capable of uttering. All others had vanished from her memory; and even that one

word she used less and less often. Charitable people brought her to Goleschti. When her poor mother saw her only child in this pitiable state, she wept bitterly and loud; but Anita smiled, for in those three terrible hours she had drained the cup of earthly suffering. What she thought and felt no human being has ever learned, her suffering remains shrouded in silence, for God in His mercy had given her forgetfulness!

The recluse in the garden was thinking of this, as the procession came out into the sun again and moved towards the churchyard. Smilingly Anita hovered round the open grave, and looked down with curiosity in her beautiful soulless eyes, as all that was left to her was lowered into the earth. Then she wandered through the bystanders and ran back to the village, past the garden where the autumn leaves were still falling noiselessly and the gossamer was weaving a halo of light about the head of the recluse.

CARMEN SYLVA.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: PARIS: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *September, 1904.*

SINCE Mr. Chamberlain, sixteen months ago, launched his Fiscal programme there have been twenty-three contested by-elections, and one uncontested. Of these twenty-four seats, seven only were held by the Liberals in May, 1903. To-day the position is almost precisely reversed. The Liberals now hold sixteen of the seats and the Tories eight. They have captured nine constituencies out of hand, and they have very considerably increased their majorities in the seats that were already theirs when Mr. Chamberlain turned his batteries on Free Trade. Altogether, the Liberal vote during the last sixteen months' campaigning has increased by nearly 30,000, while the Tory and Protectionist vote has remained little more than stationary, its total growth amounting to less than 1200. A year and more of heated Tariff controversy has taught Englishmen to suspect all figures, but there can, I think, be no mistaking the drift of these. The movement of events points with unescapable precision to a Liberal victory at the next General Election. There are some things even in politics, of which one can foresee the issue, though the manner and the time of their coming may be still uncertain; and this is one of them.

Whether Mr. Balfour dissolves Parliament or merely resigns; whether his self-destroying dexterity as a strategist—for it is rather as a House of Commons strategist than as a statesman that people now think of Mr. Balfour—will suffice to carry him on to 1906; or whether his pursuers will succeed in cornering him in the coming year, all this is at present unpredictable. But, whenever and however the battle is joined, its result is already taken for granted. The rashest Protectionist of them all is not so rash as to maintain any longer, even in public, that an election fought

out primarily on the Free Trade issue and secondly on the Education Bill, which has restored political Non-conformity to life, on the Chinese Labor question, which has jarred on the moral sense of the country to a degree perhaps hardly warranted by the facts, and on the Licensing Bill, which the public at large looks upon as little less than the free gift of a national asset to the brewers, can end in anything but a Liberal victory. Mr. Chamberlain himself, whose sanguine, speculative temperament makes him the last man to admit an unpleasant fact, has admitted this; and his followers are now repeating it, as though it were the most natural thing in the world and as though all along they had never expected anything else. It is true they keep up a show of confidence; and with politicians on the brink of visible and immediate defeat, confidence always and necessarily takes the form of prophecies. If they agree, having no choice in the matter, to forego the present, they can at least claim the future as their own. This is what the Protectionists are now doing. I am never in their company without being assured that this is not a question to be settled by a single campaign, that "the big fight" will go on in spite of an initial set-back, and that the real battle, the real concentration of all the Protectionist forces, will take place at the election after next. Well, I have seen enough of politics to distrust any prophecies that are based on the election after next.

The Protectionist assumption, to which Mr. Chamberlain has given the frankest publicity, is that, as the upshot of the first appeal to the country, the Liberals will come into power; that their majority will be a small one and dependent upon the Irish vote; that the Home Rule question, the Education question—in which, it must be remembered, the Non-conformists, who are still the backbone of English Liberalism, take essentially opposite views to the Irish Catholics,—the weakness of Liberal policy in Foreign and Imperial issues, and the personal dissensions among the Liberal leaders will quickly bring the Government to the ground in confusion and ruin, and that a second General Election will then result in a handsome Protectionist majority. That is the plan to which Mr. Chamberlain, not without a certain hasty desperation, has now pinned his faith. It is not, of course, to be taken as implying a cessation of his activities, but merely a change in their character and direction.

The furious frontal assault on the Free Trade position has con-

fessedly failed, and it is not likely that "the raging, tearing propaganda" that was convulsing the country a year ago will again be renewed with anything like its primal frenzy. Operations underground are now rather the order of the day, and Mr. Chamberlain, though he will from time to time address great public meetings, seems to have about made up his mind that he can most usefully promote his objects by perfecting and extending the Protectionist organization, and waiting for events to play into his hands. Waiting is an exercise as irksome to Mr. Chamberlain as to President Roosevelt, but to the problems of electioneering he applies himself with an American relish, an American grasp, and perhaps, too, with an American over-estimate of their importance. He has already captured the machinery of the Liberal-Unionist party; and, when the National Union of Conservative Associations meets in October, it will be found, I think, that his hand is not less firmly on the rudder of the Conservative vessel.

I must, however, again remind Americans that these opening successes, though perhaps indispensable to any final triumph, do not in themselves amount to much. The capture of the party organization is a very different thing from convincing the country. It is different even in America where the mechanism of politics is in the ascendant; it is still more different, and immensely less significant, in Great Britain, where there is nothing to correspond to the binding prerogatives and force of a National Convention, and where, in politics as in everything else, individualism is fiercely cultivated. Still, it means undeniably something that Mr. Chamberlain should have so successfully encountered the Free-Traders in his own party, should practically have driven them forth from its official councils, and should be in a position to dominate the organization of his Conservative allies. It may, perhaps, mean more than is generally foreseen. Last year the National Union of Conservative Associations was only held from siding openly with Mr. Chamberlain by the veiled threat of Mr. Balfour's resignation. There are those who think that this year it will undoubtedly go the whole distance, and that before October is out Mr. Balfour's submission to Mr. Chamberlain and to Mr. Chamberlain's policy will have been publicly made.

However that may be, it is clearly of the essence of Mr. Chamberlain's new plan to entrench himself as deeply as possible in the Unionist ranks, to seize, marshal and develop the fighting strength

of the party organizations, to lose the next election—since lose he must—by as narrow a defeat as the utmost ingenuity can contrive, to employ his matchless abilities in Opposition to discredit and paralyze the Liberal Ministry, and finally, when he has succeeded in all this, to ride into power on a wave, if not of Protectionist enthusiasm, at least of disgust with Liberals and Liberalism. But for my present purpose the most important item in this spacious programme is Mr. Chamberlain's acknowledgment that a Liberal victory at the next election is unavoidable. I quite agree with him. To all appearances, something like a national call awaits the Liberal Party. So generally is this felt to be the case that the Party's condition to meet the call, and the probable policy and personnel of its Government, are already matters of discussion only less eager than that which centres on the Fiscal Question itself.

It is close on ten years since the Liberals were last in power. One great achievement and one greater event marked their term of office between 1892 and 1895. The achievement was Sir William Harcourt's Budget of 1894; the event was Mr. Gladstone's retirement and Lord Rosebery's accession to the Premiership. I need now do no more than briefly recall how the resignation of Mr. Gladstone, the withdrawal of his commanding authority, proved a signal for something like revolt to the incongruous elements that always and everywhere compose the Party of Progress; how the Radical section resented the advent of a Peer to the leadership; how another and larger section felt deeply aggrieved that Sir William Harcourt's claims to the Premiership had been passed over; how a bitterly personal quarrel broke out between Lord Rosebery and Sir William; how Lord Rosebery's attempt to carry out a policy he had not framed with a Cabinet that was none of his choosing led in 1895 to a severe disaster at the polls; how the line he took on the Home Rule question—his announcement that it could never be granted until England, "the predominant partner," was convinced of its justice and expediency—alienated his Irish allies; and how the Armenian massacres and the divisions they provoked in the Liberal ranks, ill-health, weariness and disappointment ended in 1896 with Lord Rosebery's retirement from the party leadership.

From 1895, when the Unionists came into power with a majority of 150, to 1902, when the Peace of Vereeniging was signed, the Liberals were in the abyss. Mr. Morley and Sir William Har-

court withdrew from active politics, and the leadership of the party fell by a process of exhaustion on the shoulders of Earl Spencer in the House of Lords and of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in the House of Commons. The Boer War, while it drew Lord Rosebery, Mr. Morley and Sir William Harcourt from their seclusion, only emphasized and accentuated the seemingly hopeless divisions that separated them and their followers. The Rosebery group, small in numbers but weighty in intellect and influence, substantially approved the war and supported the Government in prosecuting it. But by far the larger portion of the Liberal Party, headed by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, violently opposed and criticised not only the policy, or lack of policy, that led to the struggle, but the methods by which it was carried on. At the General Election of 1900, the country, as was to be expected, declared emphatically against them, and gave the Unionists a renewed lease of power with a majority of 130. At that moment, the bitterness of the average Englishman against the Liberals, and the bitterness among the Liberals themselves, reached their zenith.

I cannot say that since then the Liberal Party has been rehabilitated in the confidence of the country in any positive sense. Negatively, it has immensely profited by the blunders and inefficiency of the Government. The people are visibly turning to it less because they trust either its policy or its leaders than because they have learned wholly to distrust the present Ministry. Peace and the gradual disappearance of South Africa as an electioneering issue enormously eased the Liberal situation. The nation quickly made up its mind that full credit had been given the Government for its maintenance of British power in South Africa, and that henceforth it was to be judged solely by its domestic record.

They were still further helped by a long and exasperating succession of Unionist ineptitudes. The ghastly "revelations" that followed the conclusion of the war were alone enough to discredit any Government. The Buller affair, the Corn Tax, the Education Bill, Mr. Brodrick's Army scheme, the Whitaker-Wright business, and the Venezuelan mess fed the national resentment. There were times in 1902 when only the Irish votes saved the Government from defeat. Still more frequently there were times when a vigorous Opposition might have done enormous damage by leading the universal disgust inspired by some of the Ministerial acts.

As no such Opposition existed, the country had to take the work of chastisement into its own hands. At by-election after by-election, throughout 1902 and the first few months of 1903, it smote the Government hip and thigh, and in spite of its huge majority the position of the Ministry, even then, was weak, if not absolutely precarious. Its strength was the measure of the Opposition's weakness, and conversely the strength of the Opposition, such as it was, so far from being positive and inherent, was no more than the reflex action of the Ministry's weakness. Up to the moment when Mr. Chamberlain broke into Protection a real Liberal unity was as far off as ever; and though the Government was palpably losing ground, no Liberal even for a moment dreamed of the possibility of victory at the next election.

To-day, superficially at any rate, all that is changed. The Liberals are again a united party, united by the overriding necessity of defending Free Trade. That union, daily cemented afresh by the prospect, or rather certainty, of victory, is sufficient, I think, to carry the Liberals through the next election, and to enable them to form a Government. Is it, however, strong and pervasive enough to enable them to form and carry out a policy? One must remember that the safeguarding of Free Trade is purely defensive work, work that will be done, if at all, at the polls and not in the House of Commons, and that the Liberals, once in office, cannot by any legislative measure strengthen or confirm the cause which has brought them into power. Their success will practically amount to a national vote in favor of letting things alone, and the achievement of it will be all the assistance that Free Trade needs or indeed is capable of receiving. The Liberals will, therefore, find after forming their Government that, so far as they are concerned and for the time being, the question of Free Trade, which brought them union and power, is settled, or rather has settled itself, and that there is nothing to be done, no bills to be brought forward, no measures to be proposed, that can in any way clinch the all-sufficing verdict of the polls. While restored to office, therefore, as Free-Traders, Free Trade cannot in the nature of things engage much of their time and activities, and it is in quite other fields that they will have to make their mark as legislators and administrators. And it is just here, of course, that Mr. Chamberlain is looking for an outbreak of the old friction and the old dissensions. The real question that has to be asked about

the Liberal Party is this: Does the unity which has been effected by a common devotion to Free Trade extend to other issues and other policies, or are the Liberals, apart from this single question, just as fundamentally divided among themselves as ever?

To answer this question is exceedingly difficult. There are, however, certain rocks ahead of the Liberal vessel which may be specified. One of these is Lord Rosebery. Lord Rosebery is still, as he has been for years past, the puzzle of English politics. He is the one Liberal statesman of the day who has something of genius about him. He exercises over the imagination of the country a fascination which no mistakes seem wholly able to destroy. He makes speeches, he outlines policies, he emits explosive suggestions. There is an organization, the Liberal League, founded, if not in his interests, at least to popularize his views; and a certain number of Liberal M.P.'s, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Asquith, and Sir Edward Grey among them, undoubtedly look to him for leadership and advice. Yet I should hesitate to say that Lord Rosebery is either in politics or out of politics. Nobody knows, nobody even professes to know, whether he would be ready to take office in a Liberal Government. I do not believe that Lord Rosebery himself knows. He suffers from one of the most grievous defects that a politician can possess—he has no prejudices. He lacks, too, the gregarious instinct; he remains always an individual; his whole nature kicks against the pricks of party compulsion, against those compromises and small surrenders that make the party system possible; the party view is his view only when it precisely squares with his private judgment. No one was ever more surely smitten with the curse of dispassionateness. His intellectual honesty recoils from the extremes that a party demands; he sees both sides too clearly; all his mental instincts are at war with fanaticism, exaggeration or bias of whatever kind. Lord Rosebery is never so convinced of anything as to be able to drive from his mind whatever may be urged on the other side. He is incapable of being a thorough-going partisan; and this in politics is a handicap that nothing can quite overcome. There never has been, and there is never likely to be, a great political leader who was not on occasion a ferocious partisan. But Lord Rosebery cannot simplify himself to that extent. He cannot nail his colors to an inspiring prejudice or a stimulating half-truth; the consciousness that it is a prejudice, and not the whole truth, unnerves

him. Moreover, he lacks imperiousness. He can lead only when others are ready and even anxious to follow; he cannot coerce a mutinous or discontented group into accepting his *ipse dixit*. He hates, and probably despises, the personal and contentious side of politics and the small arts of managing men. It is doubtful whether he would raise a little finger to make himself Premier again. It is true that not very long ago he asked Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey to pledge themselves not to take office under Lord Spencer; but, when both refused, he did no more. The whole nature of the man impels him to give up to mankind what was meant for his party.

Yet Lord Rosebery is still a great influence. Neither the country nor the party expects or even wishes that he will be the Premier of the new Liberal Ministry, but there would be a feeling of universal satisfaction and relief if he could be prevailed upon to accept the Foreign Secretaryship. He stands and always has stood for that "sane" Imperialism which it was never more necessary to emphasize than at this moment. He alone can clear the Liberal Party of its evil reputation—whether rightly or wrongly earned, I will not now inquire—for anti-nationalism, "Little Englandism" and indifference to the Empire. No man has stood out more strongly for the continuity of Foreign and Imperial policy, and with the question of Lord Milner's position—which, however, may, and as some think and many hope will, be solved by the offer of his resignation—and of the Chinese Labor Ordinance staring the new Liberal Ministry in the face, there is need enough for the preservation of a uniform and consistent policy. A great many Liberals would like to recall Lord Milner and repeal the Ordinance. Wiser counsels, I believe, will ultimately prevail, but there is always the danger that a Liberal Ministry may get out of touch with the rational but firmly Imperial sentiment of the nation; and against this danger Lord Rosebery's presence in the Cabinet is the only assurance that would satisfy the country.

But there is another and even more hazardous problem on which Lord Rosebery has taken a line of his own. I refer, of course, to the Home Rule question and the relations between the Liberal and Nationalist parties. Not only has he wiped the Gladstonian form of Home Rule from his slate, but both he and Mr. Asquith have declared that they would not take office in any Liberal Govern-

ment that was tied down by contract to the Irish vote. That does not, of course, exclude cooperation with the Nationalists, but it does exclude any such alliance as bound the two parties together in 1892. Lord Rosebery's Irish policy, as it has been unfolded to me by his nearest and ablest lieutenant, is to wait on events, to determine how far the general situation has been changed by the workings of the Local Government Act and the Land Purchase Act, to extend and develop local self-government in Ireland as much as possible, to inquire into and wherever possible economize on the system of Dublin Castle rule, to encourage educational, industrial and agricultural development freely—in short, to advance step by step along the humble line of practical utility, and not waste time over "heroic" measures.

When this policy was first announced (towards the end of 1901), it was at once met by a declaration from Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman that Home Rule was still a part of *his* programme; but, unquestionably, it is the Rosebery rather than the Campbell-Bannerman policy that commands the assent of most Liberals in or out of the House of Commons. The only difficulty is, How far will it satisfy the Irish? It is at this point that the size of the Liberal majority at the next election becomes crucially important. If it is so small that the Government is dependent for its very existence upon the Irish vote, Mr. Chamberlain's anticipations of a speedy collapse may yet be fulfilled. A clear (but somewhat unlooked-for) plurality over the Nationalists and Protectionists combined is the only guarantee that the Liberals will be able to develop an Irish or any other policy with real freedom. Again, there is more than a little peril lurking in the Liberal determination to amend the Education Act of 1902. Not only the Nationalists but the revolted Unionist Free-Traders, most of whom are strong High Churchmen, would be against them there. Moreover, it must be remembered that the Nationalists, in their action upon the course of English politics, are entirely detached and concerned solely with Irish interests. They will strike a bargain with any leader and any party that will do most to further their views of Irish needs; and if, as the result of the next election, they find themselves holding the balance of power between the Protectionists and the Free-Traders, it is not by any means certain—especially when one recalls Mr. Chamberlain's character and the desperate exigencies of his position—that they will neces-

sarily throw in their lot with the Free-Traders. More attractive offers may quite conceivably be forthcoming from another quarter. The Liberal path, in default of an overwhelming majority, promises therefore to have its thorns and pitfalls, both personal and political. They have, however, plenty of young, able and energetic men to choose from; they have been ten years out of office, and may be presumed to have learned some of the lessons of adversity; the influence of those Unionists who for the sake of Free Trade have broken away from their own party will be of a restraining character; and the party as a whole is deeply conscious of the folly of an overloaded programme, heroic legislation and of committing itself hopelessly in advance. All this may help to pull them through.

BERLIN, *September, 1904.*

AT a time when the Premier of England has been descanting mellifluously upon the utter inability of science to find "ultimate criteria," and again in despairing accents upon his own and everybody else's inability to discover any remedy whatsoever to check the physical deterioration of the British people, it is refreshing to turn to the buoyant optimism of the Proletarian Parliament-elect which has just concluded its labors at Amsterdam—where the predominant note is hope, the watchword "endeavor," and criteria of life and science are found and formulated in a morning's sitting. Unusual interest attached to the Congress—the sixth International Socialist Congress that has sat since the Commune—because it was the first time that the leaders of the Social Democracy had been summoned from all parts of the globe, including Japan, to sit in judgment upon party tactics, and party leaders, and the infallibility of Karl Marx. In plain words, the Congress had to pronounce for or against the Reformist or Revisionist movement; and, as was to be expected, it decided by a nationality vote of 25 to 5, with 12 abstentions, for the orthodox class revolutionary programme. That is to say, opportunist or parliamentary tactics were condemned. A vote of censure was passed on M. Jaurès; and the doctrinaire propagandist Socialism of Marx and of modern Germany, with its formula of "class war," its doctrine of revolution, and its principle of relentless opposition to capitalism and to all compromise with the *Bourgeoisie,* was triumphantly acclaimed by the Assembly.

Thus the International Tribunal has upheld the muzzling resolution passed last year at Dresden upon Bernstein, and subsequently by the Italians at Bologna. If it does not end a crisis, it forms an important landmark in it, and may mark a new era in the history of Socialism. It has shown that two Socialisms exist fundamentally incompatible the one with the other. For ideas cannot be coffined; and, though dogma has defeated rationalism, theory practice, adolescence youth, it may legitimately be doubted whether the pragmatic decision of the party as an International whole will exercise any serious restraining influence, at any rate in republican France, upon the parliamentary tactics of Jaurès or upon the man himself. Nevertheless, the vote of the most representative and collective body of men ever assembled together under the banner of Socialism in favor of "class" warfare, is a noteworthy one. Among other things, it shows that not only is Socialism the most powerful numerically in the country of the greatest autocratic ruler in Europe, but that it is also the most strenuous, the most vital intellectually, there.

Though the first note of discord was sounded by Bernstein, then living in enforced exile in England, only six years ago, the so-called revisionist movement has advanced almost as rapidly as the central movement itself. Naturally, its chief adherents are to be found in the countries where parliamentary government has been most developed, where the conditions of life are easier, where the monarchical principle is less pronounced. Thus there is no "rational" Socialism in Russia, and, on the other hand, practically no "revolutionary" Socialism in Great Britain. But, quite apart from the academic side of the question, there is unmistakable evidence that the masses,—M. Zola's "*Salariats*"—are growing less and less prone to revolutionary methods, and more and more reconciled to the principle of evolution. The old fetishist belief in the monarchical idea is rapidly dying out among the peoples of all nations; and with it the popular faith in violence, the idea of revolution as the only means to obtain the Socialist goal. And, though it is true that the power of monarchs tends to grow stronger precisely in countries where constitutional government has been freely adopted, this tendency is undoubtedly due to the same cause. Indeed, the masses would appear to be growing "softer," witness the fiasco of the General Strike in Belgium a year or so ago. The idea of the Divinity of Kings of necessity en-

genders hatred and opposition, if only by contrast. When that idea has completely vanished, probably kings will sleep "the easier o' nights"; most certainly, one of the strongest incitements to revolution will have disappeared. But be that as it may, the last five years have wrought far-reaching changes in the minds of the people. The educational force of Socialism on the Continent has been prodigious. It has given the proletariat that great gift, freedom of thought. The sacrosanctity of majesty, of aristocracy, of class rule, of religion, are things he no longer believes in. The humblest neophyte to Socialism has learned to think of himself as a human being, with a will to live and think independently. He no longer fears God or man. But he has also become less able to suffer for either. And so, naturally enough, the doctrinaire Socialism of Marx, with its hard and fast dogmas and fatalistic teaching, has ceased to exercise the magic power of old. Some have begun to doubt, and many have seen that what is applicable in one country is not at all so in other countries where conditions and institutions are fundamentally different. Thus the reformist idea has grown and spread.

In the region of criticism, Bernstein has been engaged in probing, analyzing and dissecting Marxian Socialism; in exposing gray theories, in demolishing the Ikons of dogma, in tearing down the cherished idols of the "Blanquist" or ultra-revolutionary section. He has been four times solemnly impeached, and last year was very nearly ejected from the party. If he has no personal following, he has found partisans, independent supporters, men like Von Vollmar, Auer, David, Schippel (to mention only a few) who work in the same direction. But he is lacking in fibre as a man, is no orator, no leader of men. And, as a result, his work so far has been of an entirely negative character. Though there unquestionably exists a revisionist movement in Germany, there is no recognized leader, or programme, or party; and so the solidarity of the party remains unimpaired by Bernsteinism; and, so long as present conditions in the Empire obtain, neither Bernstein nor any other leader of the opportunist's section are at all likely to gain any marked influence. In France it has been otherwise. There criticism has been silent, but practical action all the more pronounced. A Socialist enters the Ministry, sits by the side of General de Gallifet, and bows low before the Tsar. Jaurès lunches with the King of Italy, and supports the Government

loyally at times in defiance of republican traditions; finally, he overtly counsels his party to accept office when attainable and cooperate with the *bourgeois* parties. In a word, Jaurès has become a sort of John Burns in his own country, and has completely broken with the principles and traditions of Continental Socialism, which is International and violently opposed to national continuity, Particularism, and Individualism in any form whatsoever. The example of the French reformists has been followed in Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria, and naturally in England with more or less success; and there can be no doubt that, on the eve of the Amsterdam Congress, the issue was not so much whether Socialism was to abandon its revolutionary character and adopt evolutionary methods, but, rather, whether the independence of the Proletarian party, as a class, was to be upheld or abandoned in favor of alliance and fusion with the *Bourgeoisie.* This the International Council at Amsterdam has decreed against resolutely. Though this decision is by no means final, there is no gainsaying the fact that the reformist movement has been condemned: twice nationally, in Germany and Italy, and now internationally by the plenary Court at Amsterdam. Logically, the reformist movement, after five years of agitation, has thus proved a failure. The question, which time alone can solve, is: Will this be the case?

It is worth noting that the Congress dealt exclusively with the parliamentary tactics of Jaurès, and not at all with Bernstein, who, as before said, was virtually disabled at last year's Congress at Dresden. Nothing can better illustrate the solidarity, the intellectual power, of the movement than the mere fact, remarkable enough in these days of universal parliamentary decadence, that nearly 500 delegates, recruited for the most part from the lower classes—men of such varied hue and temperament as Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Austrians, Spanish, English, and Japanese—should be able to meet together, discuss, and settle the most complex and conflicting problems affecting theory and practice, swiftly, decorously, and definitively, without a trace of personal or national recrimination. There was the intellectual Socialism of France pitted against the rude dogma of Germany; the incisive logic of Jaurès against the hurricane anathemas of the former wheelwright, Bebel. Germany triumphed; yet the President did not once have to intervene. Throughout the fierce oratorical duel

between the foremost speakers of France and Germany, who attacked one another with all the dialectical force and eloquence at their disposal, not one jarring note was struck. The two men sank into the two ideas they represented. It was an assembly dominated by ideas. It may be questioned whether the same could be said of any other International parliament of men living. Never before has Bebel had to face so formidable an adversary. "You think," said Jaurès, in one of the greatest speeches he ever delivered, "that the rules applying to Germany should necessarily apply to France and elsewhere, but, though you are a splendid propagandist party, you are none the less doomed to political incapacity. You lack the two means essential to action—the tradition of revolution and parliamentary force. You did not win your suffrage, as we did, on the barricades; and your vote in the Reichstag is powerless, because your Ministers are irresponsible and your Emperor is omnipotent. You cannot advance or make any proportionate use of your power. You screen your own weakness behind the veil of dogma, and you seek to condemn the Socialists of all other countries to inaction because you and your party are forced by the condition of things in your own country to momentary impotency. You do not understand parliamentary life as it exists in England, in France, and Belgium and Switzerland, because you are hidebound by your own institutions and have not the means to alter them." This is, of course, unanswerably true. But it is a negation of the "class war" formula, which is the cardinal thesis of Marxian Socialism, and unquestionably the key to its success. And Bebel could retort with justice that opportunist tactics, as practised in countries of an advanced democratic type, dulled the class spirit of hostility to Capital, which, as it is the main characteristic of modern times, will in the future be the decisive factor in the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes. The goal is economic, not political, though the means to that end lead largely through political channels. The question at issue between the Socialism of Bebel and that of Jaurès is not so much concerned with the means to the end as with the end itself. As Bernstein once wrote: "The end is nothing, the movement everything." And, from the purely Socialist point of view, it is a very moot point whether the action of the reformists in turning themselves into a radical parliamentary party may not result in their involuntary fusion in, and ab-

sorption by, the *Bourgeoisie,* whose interests—those of Capitalism —they will support, and whose dupes they will finally be. Can the Proletarian party ever hope to obtain its goal by adopting the methods, say, of the English Labor Representation Committee—independence with cooperation? And, if so, why is it that in England, which has a larger derelict population than any other country in Europe, pure Socialism can hardly be said to exist? It is because the "class" formula is tabooed as being incompatible with parliamentary tradition. It has been said that every country has the Socialists it deserves. Which is unquestionably true. But it should not be overlooked that Continental Socialism is international, and that the interests of the proletariat, as of capitalists, are the same all the world over. It may be that the ideas of Jaurès will prevail some day in central Europe, and that the laboring classes will obtain some of their legitimate wants by the legitimate means of self-help and legislation. But will they ever, by parliamentary representation, obtain a legitimate share in the profits of labor? That is the point which the reformists ignore, because the end with them has ceased to be the object of their attention. Eliminate "class war" from Marxian Socialism, and the whole edifice falls to the ground. It becomes a doctrine without a creed. On that formula Socialism, in its economic sense, must, it would seem, ultimately stand or fall.

Meanwhile the unity of Socialism has once more been declared. Whether it will endure seems highly doubtful. Probably the reformist movement will grow within and without the central movement until the moment arrives when further attempts at reconciliation and reunion will appear senseless and undignified. In that case there would be two quite distinct homogeneous Socialisms—the one representing the lower *Bourgeoisie,* the other, by far the most powerful, the class interests of the masses.

PARIS, *September, 1904.*

WHEN M. Waldeck-Rousseau, in 1900, first read his Bill on Association, which was soon to become a Bill on Religious Associations, he was probably more favorably disposed towards religion and the religious Orders than the Ministers of the *roi très chrétien,* Louis Philippe, who were so scared at the appearance of Lacordaire in the white robe of a Preaching Friar. He shared, of course, the

secular ideas about the mutual position of Church and State; he wanted the clergy to keep to their own sphere, and that sphere he probably took to be exclusively pastoral duties, for he publicly objected to clerical education. But, whereas he insisted on a radical separation between the two powers, he bore no ill-will to the free development of religious institutions within the Church: otherwise, he would not have admitted even the notion of a monastic order. His friends, several monks among the number, will have it that his real aim was to secure the existence of the Orders against the attacks in the future which everybody foresaw. So he was by no means opposed to the ideal of Christian life embodied in the monastic life. Only he was endeavoring to regulate the existing associations—the religious orders being uppermost in his thoughts—and he could not but consider their legal status. Of the fifteen hundred congregations settled on French territory, about one-half were legally authorized, *i. e.*, had obtained, on examination of their object and regulations, official recognition. The rest only enjoyed the toleration which their good works were certain to assure them. It was especially with these seven or eight hundred unauthorized orders that the new law was concerned.

What were M. Waldeck-Rousseau's intentions with regard to them? We know them with certitude. He had no sympathy with the Jesuits, and he felt an especial dislike against one particular Order, the Assumptionists, whom he once described as "trading, plotting monks." About these his mind was evidently made up. There was also a clause in the bill which its author must have known to be irreconcilable with the continuation of the more important Orders. The Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, etc., are responsible only to the Pope and highly value their exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. Now, M. Waldeck-Rousseau wanted all Orders to be in future under the Bishops who should answer to the Government for their action. This condition, of course, made authorization an impossibility for those who could not renounce their privilege. In spite of this unfortunate circumstance, it seemed that the Bill was bringing the Orders, which the Concordat had ignored, under the protection which the Concordat gave to the Bishops and secular clergy, and M. Waldeck-Rousseau could say that he was really giving the monks and nuns their saving charter. For there was little doubt that the congregations that applied for authorization would easily get it, and they were

by no means degrading themselves by submitting to a measure which, excepting one accidental clause, was only the common law of the land. The exception in the bill to which I am alluding, in fact, betrayed a distrust of the Orders which was not in keeping with the rest of M. Waldeck-Rousseau's liberal dispositions. Whereas authorization could only be granted by an act of Parliament, after a debate in the Chamber or Senate, the same could be repealed by a decree of the Council of Ministers; that is to say, it took the consent of the country as represented by Parliament to give legal existence to a religious association, but an arbitrary act of the Government was enough to suppress it. This was certainly not democratic. However, broadly speaking and paying special attention to its initiator's intentions, the act of 1901 might be said to proceed from a spirit nearly akin to that in which Napoleon had framed the Concordat: it was a homage to religion and, at the same time, a barrier against clericalism.

So, at the end of 1901, the views of the Government in connection with Catholicism were, on the whole, hardly different from those which prevailed in the days when the sovereign could be on his guard against episcopal influence, without disbelieving a syllable in the Bishops' teaching. In May of the following year, the general election took place. M. Waldeck-Rousseau resigned, and M. Combes came into office. This event brought about a complete change in ecclesiastical policy. M. Waldeck-Rousseau was not a statesman of the first order, but he had a comprehensive intellect, wide political experience, and the tinge of scepticism which people occasionally noticed in him served at least to differentiate him from the partisan. M. Combes was known as a doctrinaire, a man who had started with the narrowest Catholic philosophy and had reached the other extreme without ever enlarging his speculative outlook. He was well acquainted with educational and naval questions, but he had hardly had any experience of government, having been Minister of Education only for a few months; and one had reason to suspect he would treat politics as a purely speculative matter. This forecast proved true, in so far as the Premier never swerved from the line he had drawn for himself, viz., fierce anti-clericalism to the exclusion of everything else; but M. Combes surprised both friends and enemies by an adroitness in difficult emergencies which nobody expected from him. He seems to have viewed his rôle not as that of the re-

sponsible statesman, who has a policy of his own and fights to make it prevail, but as that of the subordinate who sticks to his orders and, by hook or by crook, by violence or by dexterity, carries them out. It was M. Waldeck-Rousseau's bitterest sorrow in his dying months to see the law he designed as an instrument of justice become one of narrow partisanship.

The reader remembers how the Association Law was applied; one should rather say how it never was applied. Each demand for authorization was to be separately examined by the Chamber or Senate. M. Combes decided that all the applications should be thrown into three divisions, and *not* examined separately but accepted or rejected bodily. The ballot on this interpretation showed a decrease of the ministerial majority to sixteen votes instead of about seventy, and elicited a public protest from M. Waldeck-Rousseau: but the congregations were none the less dispersed and their property confiscated. For this confiscation no satisfactory reason was ever given. On the contrary, the ingrafted hostility against all Orders, charitable as well as contemplative, evidenced in the vote, found hundreds of apologists in Parliament and in the press. These men have turned with equal success two opposite theories against the congregations; and the evolution from one to the other accounts for much we see and anticipates a great deal of what is to come.

Under the *ancien régime,* the doctrine of Divine Right made the King's will absolute and final. Against this absolutism popular feeling rebelled for centuries, till it was eventually blown away at the Revolution. Then for the Rights of the King were substituted the Rights of Man. The foundation of this famous declaration—still placarded in every school and town hall of France—lies in Rousseau's dogma of man's natural goodness and his claim to complete liberty in order to develop his faculties. This means individualism, or, as it is called, Liberalism. Man is entitled to as much freedom as will not be hurtful to his neighbor. This notion, at first sight, seems to favor a toleration of monasticism, as a man may apparently be a monk if he pleases. Not so, argue the champions of the Rights of Man: nobody ought to be suffered to renounce his own personality by taking the vows of poverty, obedience and chastity. The conclusion was that M. Combes had been a champion of liberty and a redeemer of slaves in refusing authorization to the monks who applied for it. Another corollary

was that his duty was, moreover, to revoke the authorization from the Orders which were in enjoyment of it. The principle—strictly a jurist's principle—of the Act of 1901 was against this further step, but the Premier ought not to forget that the Act contained a clause empowering the Cabinet to withdraw authorization when they chose; and, besides, M. Combes was already persuaded that another Bill could easily be introduced to amend the Act. In March of the present year, a bill was read depriving the authorized teaching Orders of their legal existence. It was passed in July, and the process of expulsion was immediately resumed.

As the "arraignment of immorality" can be hurled against the charitable and contemplative congregations, just as well as against those employed in education, we can look upon monasticism as virtually a thing of the past in France.

Monasticism being condemned in the name of Liberalism, is the religious question at last settled? It appears that it is only opened. Besides the regular or conventual, there are the secular or parochial, clergy, on the legal position of whom another philosophy is brought to bear. We are only entering upon another stage of the anti-clerical campaign. Liberalism and the Rights of Man were scarcely mentioned during the debate on the teaching Orders to which I referred above. Another doctrine, widely different, is now taken for granted. For some years we have been treated in the special reviews to discussions of the disastrous economical consequences of Liberalism. From those periodicals the mistrust spread to metaphysical and political magazines. It has been asserted that the individual has no rights, as he lives in society, is part and parcel of society, and can only speculatively be said to be an individual at all. Society alone has rights and communicates them to its members, as it thinks advisable. A Toulouse professor, M. Bouglé, has upheld this doctrine in a book which M. Faguet, the French academician, refutes in his volume on Liberalism. As may be imagined, there is a good deal of hair-splitting in those very speculative pages, as the duties of society eventually prove to be very much the same thing as the ousted rights of the individual. But hair-splitting would be poor work in a Parliament, and the French deputies rest satisfied with the new formula that nobody has any rights but society, or, as they very inaccurately interpret it, the State. The reason for depriving the congregations of the right of teaching was not only that their vows

rendered them immoral and dangerous to youth, but chiefly that the right of teaching is invested in the State, is no natural claim of the individual citizen, and can be conceded or revoked at pleasure.

But if this be admitted, M. Jaurès and M. Buisson urged, why not withdraw the permission of teaching from the secular clergy, who conduct about half of our secondary schools? Their reasoning is cogent, and although the law of 1852 on the liberty of teaching had been confirmed by the Senate in the spring of this year, M. Combes only postponed not an answer but the fulfilment of his promise, till after the separation of Church and State. The tendency to secularize the school and the hospital, and to confine Christianity to its place of worship, is therefore visible.

What is the situation of the Church to be when she is thus restricted to her primary object? If the Concordat were not on the eve of disappearing, we should only have to say that the Church would be in exactly the same position as in 1802, when there were no religious Orders, no clerical schools, and when the clergy, weakened and thinned by ten years' persecution, had enough to do to serve the parochial churches. She would be in regular intercourse with Rome through a Nuncio and Bishops appointed by the Pope on the one hand, supported and, to a certain extent, controlled by the State on the other. But disestablishment is no longer a castle in the air. To-day, the recall of the French Ambassador from Rome and of the Nuncio from Paris necessitates a radical solution. The Church must be before many months separated from the State, and the question now is: What is the situation to be after that separation?

In America, where individualism and Liberalism are living facts and not subject-matter for metaphysicians, the average reader understands the term "Catholic Church" as standing for the collectivity of Roman Catholics, flock as well as Bishops. Catholicism appears as a doctrine and a way of life which a man chooses for himself, and follows. In France the term only means the governing body, *i. e.*, the Bishops and priests. It is never used in the Chamber in another sense. The citizen as a believer never occurs to the parliamentary mind. It is just the reverse in England when the legislator thinks of the Wesleyans or Presbyterians: he knows he deals rather with individuals than with a community. The French notion results from the religious indifference of most members of the Parliament, the faithful mirror in this of most of

the electorate, and also from the recollections of a time when the Church was one of the Three States and the greatest power in the country. Its first consequence is that the Church is regarded, even by moderate Republicans, as a weakened but still dangerous influence. Napoleon, who thought the clergy indispensable allies of his restorative policy, never viewed them as citizens in the full enjoyment of their rights (the liberal concept), but as *fonctionnaires* whom he chose, paid and made use of.

Of the deputies who will soon decide on a new legal status for the Church of France, at least a third—most of M. Méline's former party—hold the same Gallican opinions. Liberals though they be, an inveterate habit will cause them still to look upon the Church as a more or less necessary State institution. The denunciation of the Concordat means for them forty million francs saved yearly, not the liberty of the citizens who henceforward will have to find the money. They have never found fault with the restrictive clauses in the Concordat (those, for instance, prohibiting a Bishop from travelling outside his diocese to visit a brother or even the Pope, or forbidding the publication of a papal document without special permission); and they would be disturbed if the clergy were suddenly given the liberty of, say, a vast commercial association. In their hearts French legislators always lean towards the absolute sovereignty of the State. So, at best, the future position of the Church would not be very different from what it has been so far. But the moderate deputies whose tendencies I am describing are only a section of the Chamber, and most of them in the minority. The Radicals call them "reactionaries" and "Jesuits in disguise," and the Radicals will eventually pass the Disestablishment Act in the form they please. Now—judging by the most intelligent and fairest, though the most violent, of them, M. Clémenceau—they will do their utmost to keep the clergy in its present dependence on the State, and at the same time to isolate them from the Pope, whom they insist on calling—I am only quoting polite language—"a foreign monarch." It cannot be doubted that they would gladly welcome a national or schismatic church. It cannot be doubted either that the present Government cherishes the same hope. By taking the side of the two Bishops whom the Pope wanted to try for alleged misconduct, M. Combes removed all doubt of his real intentions. Therefore we must expect some anti-Roman paragraphs in the Act. They do not appear

in the bill as drawn up by M. Briand, but they are very likely to be inserted in the course of the debate, and the Radicals will evidently maintain that the "foreign monarch," whose utterances could not be made public in France when he had an ambassador there, will have less title than ever to speak authoritatively. I wish I had more space in which to give some idea of the bill. Its trend will be plainly seen when I say that the clergy will not even be allowed to buy their churches back, nor to rent them for a longer tenure than five years, nor to own other property than stock, and no more capital than will be necessary for their expenditure; finally, they will not be at liberty to say what they please in their churches, and a scale of fines is provided for language that may be deemed offensive. We are far from M. Waldeck-Rousseau's ideal.

Yet the Socialistic friends of the Premier would like something more, and we must own they are true to logic. Their charge of immorality falls as well on the seculars—since they take the vow of perpetual celibacy — as on the Regulars. Their primary doctrine, that earth must become an Eden, is also contradicted by the Christian dogma of suffering and probation here below to secure happiness in the hereafter. In truth, they simply long for a revolution in the discipline and teaching of the Church, and as they doubt its possibility, they would gladly revert to the sweeping methods of their ancestors, the Revolutionists, and have done with Christianity altogether. We remember their outcry when M. Combes once asserted his belief in the spirituality of the soul, and we have not forgotten M. Jaurès's fierce attack against the Gospel, which, he says, contains implicitly even the Syllabus. Their aim is, after getting rid of the monastic orders, the clerical schools, the Concordat and Roman influence, to get rid, at last, of all Christian teaching and worship. To this extremity the logic of anti-clericalism pushes them.

Will M. Combes follow the Socialists so far, or will they be content with the suppression of the Concordat and the establishment of as national a church as possible? If they should insist on the more radical measures, M. Combes would be doomed at once. But they have learned to be content with a little when they cannot get much, and they will probably put up with an enslaved church till they see their way to "no church at all." In spite of the undisguised hostility of such formidable rivals as MM. Mille-

rand and Doumer, I shall not be greatly surprised if the Premier finds himself safe on the other side of the worst difficulty he ever encountered. But it will be his last success. For the incline down which he rolls brings him to a turning-point where the Socialists will place him face to face with economical reforms impossible to a *bourgeois,* and then we shall see either a reaction with M. Doumer or M. Rouvier, or a revolution with M. Jaurès.

WASHINGTON, *September, 1904.*

SINCE the adoption of the gold standard in the United States was definitely settled in 1900 by a second pronouncement at the ballot-box, no American question has deserved so much attention on the part of thoughtful men in European capitals as the question whether President Roosevelt or Judge Parker will occupy the White House during the four years beginning March 4, 1905. The question includes three inquiries, none of which can be answered until the decision of the voters shall be known. Is the Dingley tariff to be maintained substantially intact during the next Presidential term, or is it to undergo material alterations through revision and reciprocity? Will the American people proclaim a fixed determination to retain possession permanently of the Philippines, or will they announce a purpose of treating them as Cuba has been treated, and, consequently, of giving them absolute independence at an early date? A renunciation of the islands would involve, we scarcely need to say, the removal of the United States from the list of Powers deeply interested in the future of China. In the third place, will the Monroe Doctrine receive during the coming quadrennium the construction and expansion which Mr. Roosevelt has given it by deed and word, or will it be applied on the narrower lines approved by a series of Democratic Presidents from the original propounder of the doctrine to the author of the Venezuela Message. A good deal of light is cast on these inquiries by the acts and declarations of Mr. Roosevelt's Administration, by his speech of acceptance and his letter of acceptance, and by the platform framed for the Republican party at Chicago. From the opposite political quarter some illumination is shed by the platform put forward by the Democratic National Convention, and by its nominee's speech of

acceptance, which presently will be supplemented by a letter of acceptance, not published at the hour when we write. With all of these data before them, foreign observers should be able to judge what the outcome of our approaching general election will signify from the view-point of world-politics.

Great Britain, Germany and France, our principal competitors in the export of manufactured articles, are particularly concerned with the effect which the coming election may have upon our tariff. It is a mistake to assume that the triumph of Judge Parker at the ballot-box would have no fiscal consequences, owing to the fact that his Republican opponents are practically certain to command a majority in the Federal Senate during the next four years. Political history warrants the belief that, if the popular verdict should be in Judge Parker's favor, the revisionists within the ranks of the Republican party itself, who have been temporarily silenced, would make themselves heard in Massachusetts, on the one hand, and in Iowa and other Western States, on the other, and would call in such peremptory tones for changes in the free list and in certain schedules of the Dingley tariff, that a sufficient number of their Senators, though ostensibly Republican, might feel constrained to vote with their Democratic colleagues, and thus secure the enactment of the desired measure. It is quite conceivable that peremptory instructions to that end might be given by the Legislatures of Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan and Massachusetts. Much the same thing may be said of reciprocity, should the Democrats be successful at the polls. In that event, the General Court, as the Legislature of Massachusetts is termed, would be almost certain to order its representatives in the Federal Senate to vote for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and her example would be likely to be followed in some other States. If Mr. Roosevelt, on the other hand, should be chosen Chief Magistrate, no early and drastic revision of the Dingley tariff need be looked for, and the conclusion of a reciprocity treaty with any foreign country is exceedingly improbable. We are, practically, debarred from making any agreement of the kind with *sugar-producing* countries, because the dominant element in the Republican party loaded the Cuban reciprocity treaty with a stipulation that the Dingley tariff should remain intact as regards all other purveyors of sugar. A reciprocity treaty with Canada or with Newfoundland would not, on that score, be impracticable,

but would be strenuously resisted on other grounds by the high-protectionists, who proved at Chicago that they control the Republican party. Great Britain has a special reason for viewing with anxiety the bearing which our Presidential election may have on the prospects of reciprocity treaties with Canada and Newfoundland. The conclusion of such treaties would tend to cause the inhabitants of those self-governing colonies to repel the overture made in the preferential tariff urged by Mr. Chamberlain.

Not only China and Japan, but Russia, Great Britain, Germany and France are manifestly concerned to know whether the Philippines are to remain permanently in American hands. If the United States are to continue for an indefinite period to be a Far-Eastern Power, we cannot well escape entanglement in the affairs of neighboring countries, and our fleets and armies are likely to be so increased as to become potential factors in the settlement of controversies affecting the Pacific coast of Asia. If, on the other hand, we should decide to evacuate the Philippine Archipelago, we should no longer feel called upon to maintain a naval or military force in the Pacific, except so far as a few warships might from time to time be needed to enforce observance of our commercial treaties. In England and Japan, our retirement from that quarter of the globe would be witnessed with regret; while it might be viewed with satisfaction in Russia, Germany and France, which recognize the sincerity of our desire to uphold the territorial integrity and political stability of China.

Foreign observers who would like to forecast the effect of our forthcoming election on our Philippine policy, may do well to note the material change which has taken place in the attitude of both our chief political parties toward this question since 1900. A Washington correspondent of the New York "Evening Post" has pertinently recalled that, four years ago, the chief Republican argument for the retention of the Philippines was that every vote cast for Bryan would be interpreted by the insurrectionists in the archipelago as a vote of sympathy, and that, hence, to uphold American sovereignty and American dignity, to say nothing of relieving American soldiers from unnecessary danger, it was indispensable to support the Republican ticket. No such claim now can be or is put forward by the Republicans, because no insurrectionists exist. The principal issue as regards the Philippines seems to be over a declaration of purpose as to the future of

the islands. The Republican platform draws attention to the fact that the Filipinos have already received an instalment of self-government, and promises that a larger and larger measure of home rule shall be accorded to them, in proportion as they show themselves qualified to profit by it. It is tacitly assumed, however, that our Federal Government is to be the sole judge of the approach of the islanders to fitness to care for their own affairs. It is also to be borne in mind that the Republican platform refrains from intimating that, at any time or under any circumstances, absolute independence will be granted to the Philippines. The Democratic platform, on the other hand, as interpreted and supplemented by a subsequent utterance of Judge Parker's, does make such a promise; and it is a fair inference from the known sincerity of the Democratic nominee that, if successful at the ballot-box, he would make an earnest effort to carry the promise out. Whether he would succeed in doing so is doubtful, for the reason that, not only his fellow Democrats, but their Republican opponents are divided on the question.

The same correspondent of the "Evening Post," whom we have previously mentioned, points out that it is impossible to reconcile the expressed views of ex-Secretary of War Root, of the present Secretary of War Taft, of President Roosevelt and of others who have some intimate acquaintance with the problem, on the one hand, and the bold declarations, on the other, of certain Western Republican Conventions in support of the permanent retention of the Philippines at all hazards. It is doubtful whether the employers of the phrase "at all hazards" are alive to the gravity of the economic issues that the retention of the islands may involve. There is no doubt that many Republicans, as well as almost all Democrats, will eventually ask why the United States should contribute out of their Federal Treasury for all sorts of services in the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico, when those countries pay no revenue to the United States. The Philippine scouts, which are displacing the United States army in the Philippines, are paid out of War Department appropriations. The Philippine Census has been almost wholly paid for by the United States. Various services are maintained on a half-and-half basis, our Federal Treasury contributing a moiety of the cost. How long will our taxpayers consent to do this, in view of the fact that the Philippines pay nothing to our national exchequer. Of course, they

could be made to pay something by including them in our tariff system, as we should be at liberty to do after the expiration of the ten-year period stipulated in the Treaty of Paris. It is extremely improbable, however, that either political party would deliberately advocate the "closed door" in the Philippines, for this would involve a repudiation of our persistent declarations with regard to China. Then, again, our taxpayers are likely to ask whether it is worth while to go on increasing our navy for the purpose, largely, of protecting an archipelago which is a drain upon our financial resources. The Republican Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives was credited some months ago with an estimate, which must be deemed conservative, that a naval establishment two-thirds as great as it now is would suffice to defend the United States, if we should get rid of the Philippines. These economical arguments against the retention of the islands may be recognized as potent, even in times of peace. They are reinforced by the forecast of the tremendous sacrifices that we might have to make in order to protect the islands, should a determination to conquer them be evinced by Japan, or by some other Power with naval stations in the Far East.

We pass to the third inquiry of interest to the outside world, the inquiry, namely, how our application of the Monroe Doctrine may be affected by the outcome of our general election. The view of the doctrine which would be taken by Judge Parker may easily be defined, for it would differ not a whit from that exemplified in Mr. Cleveland's second Administration. That is to say, a Democratic President would not permit a European Power to acquire territory belonging to a Latin-American Republic on the plea of readjusting boundaries, or on any other pretext whatever. On the other hand, he would not interpose to shield a Latin-American Republic from the attempt of a European Power to exact reparation for an insult to its flag, or for injury to its official representatives, or for an act of violence committed against the person or property of a subject or citizen; provided the reparation exacted did not take the form of territorial dismemberment, or of such permanent or prolonged crippling of the wrong-doer's financial resources as practically would, in Monroe's words, "control her destiny." It is equally certain that a Democratic President would draw a sharp distinction between wrongs or *torts*, on the one hand, and debts arising out of contract, on the other, to

which latter class of obligations he would probably hold the maxim "*caveat emptor*" applicable. He certainly would not countenance an attempt to enforce by a blockade, or by a protracted occupation of custom-houses, the virtual confiscation of an American republic's revenues, merely because default had been made in the payment of the principal or interest of a debt, the outcome of a transaction into which the foreign creditor entered with his eyes wide open. Much less would he *coöperate* in an effort thus to compel the liquidation of a civil indebtedness, or himself play the part of debt-collector in the interest of a foreign creditor. Yet such an extraordinary expansion, not to say distortion, of the doctrine formulated by Monroe seems to be deliberately contemplated by President Roosevelt, if we may judge from the ominous statement made by him in a letter read at the "Cuban Dinner." In that letter he said that, if a nation acts with decency in *industrial* and political matters, if it keeps order and *pays its obligations,* then *it need fear no interference from the United States.* The obvious inference is that, if a Latin-American Republic should *not* act with decency in industrial matters, and pay its obligations, then it would have cause to dread interference from the United States, which, as the President seems to assume, would arrogate the right of defining what constitutes decency and obligations. Mr. Roosevelt has also said, with reference to the Latin-American republics, that whoever claims liberty as a right must accept the responsibilities that go with the exercise of the right. Is the payment of debts arising out of contract one of the responsibilities which, if undischarged, would justify a President of the United States in permitting the delinquent commonwealth to pass into the hands of a receiver, or, in other words, to undergo the fate of Egypt? It seems incredible that Mr. Roosevelt can have weighed the significance of his words. But there they stand; and, if they mean anything, they mean that Mr. Roosevelt, if he continues in the White House, would either permit a foreign creditor, like Germany, for example, to Egyptianize a debtor-State in Latin America, or that, on the creditor's behalf, he would himself undertake the Egyptianizing process. The suggestion that an American Chief Magistrate should make himself a sheriff, and receive for European creditors at the expense of the political or financial independence of an American republic, would have sent a shiver of horror through the late James Monroe.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXVI.

NOVEMBER, 1904.

THE YELLOW PERIL IS THE GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR JAPAN.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, BARON KENTARO KANEKO, LL.D., OF THE HOUSE OF PEERS OF JAPAN.

WHY the special mission of Prince Iwakura to the European and American governments, in 1872, failed in its attempt to revise our extra-territorial treaty was a mystery to the Japanese people. Why our promulgation of the codes of civil, criminal and commercial laws, with the organizations of the courts and of their procedures, in accordance with Western principles of Christian nations, proved to be of no avail for the abolition of consular jurisdiction in Japan, was again a perplexing mystery to Japanese jurists. And why, for twenty-five years, some of the European governments so persistently waved aside the rightful appeals made to them by Japanese diplomats for the restoration of the autonomy of the Japanese Empire, was not merely a mystery, but a heart-rending mystery, to the statesmen of Japan.

But this mystery was casually explained to me in the year 1892, when I attended the meeting of the Institute of International Law at Geneva, with the special purpose of discussing the report of a committee, to which the Institute had intrusted the task of investigating the condition of Oriental nations with a view to abolishing extra-territorial treaties in the East. On my home-

Copyright, 1904, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

ward journey, I met in Paris one of the most famous European publicists, who, in the course of our conversations said, substantially in these words: "However closely your codes may approximate to those of Europe, the Western Powers will hesitate to consent to the abolition of the extra-territorial treaties with Japan. They withhold that consent because they fear that, should they return to Japan the full exercise of national independence, she will become great and powerful in the East—a contingency which, they believe, would only arise at the expense and to the menace of their own interests in Asia. It is, therefore, their policy to subject Japan to their oppressive yoke as long as possible."

Words like these seemed to sound the death knell of all our aspirations. For a quarter of a century Japan had, at enormous cost—even at the sacrifice of her priceless traditions—been striving to assimilate her laws and institutions to those of the Western world, with no other object than that of restoring her national autonomy. Yet these utterances of the eminent publicist convinced us that the argument from justice, morality, and humanity had no weight with the European diplomats to the furtherance of our rightful demands. Disappointed, but not discouraged—shocked, but without a murmur—we calmly submitted to our fate! At least, this chilling admonition had given us the secret key to the long-sealed casket of European diplomacy in Asia. In the region of world-diplomacy, where reason fails, there is but one course left. That course Japan was compelled and determined to follow by devoting herself to the completion of her compulsory education system, to the fostering of her industry and commerce, and to the reorganization of her army and navy by modern scientific methods. At last came the event in consequence of which Japan was no longer compelled to beg for a revision of the extra-territorial treaty, but could force upon the Western nations a recognition of her competence to abolish that treaty. After our victory in the China-Japan war of 1894-5 the Western nations discovered in us a Power which they could no longer suppress by keeping us ostracized as a semi-independent nation; they at once changed their attitude, and admitted us to membership in the family of civilized nations.

Having thus, by one victorious campaign against our mighty neighbor, China, restored our national independence; having definitely taken our place in the rank and file of the civilized

Powers of the world, we continued along the peaceful path which we had marked out for our diplomacy, by cultivating the most cordial relations with the nations of Europe and America—relations which remained untroubled by the slightest cloud until the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war in February last. It was only after Japan had shown herself in the present struggle to be a match for the most formidable military power in Europe, it was only after she had drawn the bewildered attention of the whole world to her military and naval equipment, her extraordinary successes on land and sea, that we heard again the cry of "Yellow Peril."

What does this epithet mean, when calmly examined? Does it indicate a danger really existing? We may throw light on this question by recalling analogous phrases aimed at other nationalities; of these, one example will suffice. Not many years ago, the cry of "American Peril" was raised. For, when it was found that the United States, with her enormous resources and the wonderful energy of her people, was fast taking a rank among the world Powers, Europeans, scenting peril from America, raised a cry of alarm that echoed even in our country. They even went so far as to plan a "European Alliance," the object of which was to shut out American manufactured goods from the continents of the Old World. Just so, at the present juncture of our war with Russia, certain European politicians have thought fit, assuming a similarly uncharitable attitude towards Japan, to overwhelm her with an undeserved reproach, at the moment when she is forced into a struggle for her existence.

But of what nature is this alleged danger from the "yellow races"? Those who raise the cry tell us that, if Japan wins in this conflict, she will become supreme in the East, will thereupon unite all the Oriental peoples, and will proceed to drive out all Europeans and Americans from the continent of Asia. We are further assured that, when Japan is thus dominant, freedom, even civilization itself, will take flight from the Orient; the dire outcome of Japanese ascendency will be a policy of "Asia for the Asiatics." Such a policy, we may remark, would in one respect be not unnatural; it would be based on feelings which are instinctive in every people. Is not the "Monroe Doctrine" itself, which has played so important a rôle in the development of the United States, founded on the principle of "America for the

Americans"? And what, during the past forty years, has united the Italian people and enabled Italy to take rank as a member of the family of nations, if not the policy of "Italy for the Italians," as carried out under Victor Emmanuel?

As individual right to ownership in land is recognized, so, in the realm of politics, regard is paid to the territorial rights of nations. Now Asiatics have enjoyed, from time immemorial, the possession of the soil of Asia; their right to its territory has never been disputed. Why, then, should they not assert the principle of "Asia for the Asiatics"? Without territorial rights, the sense of national independence is impossible. This possession gone, no form of casuistry can help the Oriental peoples to hold their own against the aggressive competition of the Occidental Powers; we must have, to the full, the sense of national independence which is founded on the universal recognition of territorial rights.

"Blessed are the meek," is one of the precepts of the Christian faith, "for they shall inherit the earth!" For many years the missionaries have taught this precept to the Asiatics; but it has never been practised by the so-called Christian Powers in their dealings with Oriental nations. Indeed, the direct contrary has been the fact; for, many a time during the past fifty years, it has been shown that a nation's surest step to its "disinheritance" of the earth is to be meek and to remain meek. That a cry should arise in the East demanding "Asia for the Asiatics" is thus a natural outcome of the policy which the Christian Powers have pursued in that part of the world. Most of the Oriental nations, to be sure, lack the strength which is needed for successful resistance to the process of territorial "disinheritance." Consider the encroachment of the French in Tongking; the occupation of Kiao-Chao by the Germans; the aggressive movement of Russia in Manchuria—for these are the most striking examples of the "disinheritance" by which China has been despoiled. Only Japan, of all the Eastern nations, has thus far been able to maintain her independence, against continual foreign aggression. If there is a peril in the East, it is not the "Yellow Peril," but the "White Peril"; the former being a mere myth, while the latter is an actual reality.

Does it follow, however, that, should Japan be victorious in the present struggle and become supreme in the East, she will proceed to exclude Europeans and Americans from Oriental coun-

tries? The facts all point the other way. Instead of trying to shut Americans and Europeans out, Japan so far has done all in her power to attract them to the East. Consider what happened after the war with China in 1894-5. Japan then had China at her mercy, and was able at Shimonoseki to dictate to that Power any terms she cared to impose. But what did she actually do? Instead of seeking her own interests to the neglect of the other Powers, Japan seized the opportunity to promote the policy of the "open door" by providing for the abolition of the *likin* system—the system, which so long prevailed in China, of levying duties on imported goods as they crossed the frontiers of the different provinces on their way to the interior. Japan made another contribution to international welfare at that time by causing China to open four ports to the commerce of the world—the ports of Chung-Kiang, Shasi, Kow-Choo, and Soochoo. Last, but not least, she induced China to grant foreigners the right to establish industrial factories in China. All these concessions had been sought by Western diplomats for many years at Peking, but such efforts proved unavailing, until independent action was taken by Japan at the signing of the Shimonoseki Treaty in 1895. Is it not plain that, if the Japanese had entertained the slightest desire to drive Americans and Europeans from the continent of Asia, they would have made an altogether different treaty with China from the one they made—would, in a word, have sought to secure exclusive advantages for themselves? Instead, the diplomats of Japan devoted themselves sincerely to the task of opening China to the whole world. Even after the return of Wei-hai-wei to China, we made no protest against the occupation of that strategical harbor by the English.

This broader view of Japan's responsibilities as a world Power has appeared in other connections as well. The story was circulated, for instance, during the Spanish-American war, that Japan was secretly assisting the Filipinos, by sending ammunition, and even soldiers, to the aid of Aguinaldo. But the rumor was afterward proved to be false. Not only was Japan not assisting Aguinaldo and the Filipinos, but she was actually giving moral support to the United States in its plans for the occupation of the Philippine Islands, since she considered that the occupation of the islands by the American Republic was the only way to maintain peace among the Filipinos. One might readily multiply such ex-

amples to show to our friends that Japan never entertained the idea of closing the Asiatic continent against Europeans and Americans. From the beginning of our intercourse with the Western Powers, we have earnestly tried to introduce Western civilization into the Far East, and have consistenly promoted that civilization in the interests of universal peace.

When the cry of "Yellow Peril" began to be heard, we were aroused to a study of the subject, and its international effects. After the opening of our first parliament in 1890, the attitude of the Western Powers towards Japan underwent a change. We felt that Europe and America were kindly patronizing us, simply patting us on the back. It seemed to us as if our Western friends were saying: "Yes, you have done wonders. You have introduced constitutional government and adopted Western civilization. In the last fifteen years, you have made simply prodigious strides. You are, indeed, a most promising nation!" But there came a further change. When our war with China in 1894-5 ensued, and we showed our superiority to China in that struggle, the Western Powers no longer attempted to pat us on the back. They began to treat Japan with respect, for they recognized in her a naval and a military strength which they had never before suspected.

When we studied the international relations of modern Powers to each other, we found that a country like Belgium or Denmark receives from England the same consideration as Germany in all her diplomatic dealings; that Switzerland is treated by France with the same regard as the United States; and that the respect which is shown to such countries is an acknowledged international right. But a further question is: Do these smaller nations enjoy that deeper respect which is founded on fear? Can they command the esteem which is everywhere paid to their more powerful neighbors, such as Germany, France or England? The answer is obvious. In the realm of diplomacy, the nations treat each other with equal deference, making no distinction on the basis of territory or strength of armament. Yet, since, in the event of international ruptures, there is no other way to settle them than the appeal to arms, a nation, in order to maintain her independent position in the midst of international rivalries, must command sources of power which will inspire other nations, not simply with respect, but with fear. This fear is an evidence of such power in the nation feared, and that power, further, may justly or unjustly be

regarded as a potential peril. Therefore, the cry of "Yellow Peril" is a recognition by the Western nations that Japan has at last attained her long-sought-for rank among the great Powers.

But logic falters when power of such sort is supposed to engender inevitable peril. We are profoundly convinced that the possession of an ample war equipment is necessary (temporarily, at least) if nations are to reap the benefits of our complex modern civilization, provided always that their military and naval forces are not used in the pursuit of selfish ends, for the purposes of aggressive ambition. We recognize a close relation between readiness for war, which on the surface is fraught with menace, and the assured peace which powerful armaments never fail to promote and maintain. History furnishes evidence for the generalization that, the stronger a nation's army and navy, the greater is its certainty of peace—a view expressed at the Peace Conference at The Hague by an eminent English delegate who had come to take part in that movement for the abolition of war. Japan herself has a motto, dating from the earliest time in the life of her people, which runs: "Never forget the arts of war, even in the time of peace!" Nor can Japan afford to forget "the arts of war"; for, while she is, in a geographical sense, situated very advantageously in the world of commerce, the advantage carries with it the constant menace of enforced contact with the most powerful nations on the face of the globe. Consequently, while Japan truly has at heart the interests of peace, her very position in the East compels her to guard peace, for herself and for others, with an efficient army and navy.

Some may ask: What are the national aspirations of Japan? Our aim, as shown by the whole course of our modern history, is to introduce to the distant and long-neglected East the blessings of Western civilization. For a task of this kind, Japan possesses superb advantages. Planted on her island throne in the midst of the Pacific, she reaches out towards every direction from which that civilization may come, westward through the Suez Canal, under English supervision, and eastward through the Panama Canal (when that is completed), under American protection. Japan will engirdle the globe, thus reaching every quarter in the Old World as well as the New, and gathering in the richest fruits of Western culture and science, which she will proceed to disseminate among the Japanese islands. Along all these waterways,

the Western nations will bring their treasures and their civilization to the vast continent of Asia; and will also knock at the door of Japan in their turn. Hearty, indeed, will be the welcome which the Japanese will give to the Western bearers of the civilization from which we have ourselves benefited so much! But the door of Japan must be kept open, for we wish our welcome to be not only hearty, but continuous, as will be the stream of those Western gifts from Europe and America through which we shall alone be enabled, strengthening our own power, to realize our national aspirations, and especially to maintain that peace which is the foundation of progress in the Far East.

For a thousand years or more after the introduction of Chinese culture, which became merged in her ethnic life, Japan had the good fortune to possess an Oriental civilization of her own, embodied in language, art, customs and institutions. But, after the visit of Commodore Perry, in 1853, following the example set us by our ancestors when they introduced Chinese ideas, we turned to the West for culture and science, and thus the laws, the philosophy, the religion and art of Occidental civilization were engrafted upon our institutions. The Japanese mind is earnestly engaged in moulding into one the two forms of culture, the Oriental and the Occidental, its ambition being to harmonize them, even as Rome harmonized the militarism of the northern tribes with the culture of the southern races of Europe.

Such, then, is the ultimate aspiration, the crowning ambition, of the Japanese race. By reconciling and inter-assimilating the two civilizations, Japan hopes to introduce Western culture and science into the continent of Asia, and thus to open up for the benefit of the world, with equal privilege for every nation, and peace assured to all, the teeming wealth of the Chinese Empire. Nothing less than an aim thus ideal and lofty is what Japan aspires to realize; and, should fortune not forsake her, she will be content with nothing less. In the light, therefore, of what has been said, the alarm about a "Yellow Peril" takes on the character of a golden opportunity for Europe and America to become acquainted with the real strength and ambitions of Japan. The same cry, moreover, intended to work us injury and disgrace, provides Japan with a golden opportunity to show the world that selfish ambition has no part in the aspirations of her people.

BARON KENTARO KANEKO.

WHERE AND HOW RUSSIA IS TO GET HER NEXT LOAN.

BY YVES GUYOT.

I.

THERE has been quite a discussion going on over the question of contraband of war, and the whole matter remains very confused and obscure. The fact is that the most efficacious of all kinds of contraband of war is unquestionably gold, for with money all the rest can be obtained. But Russia, which has shown such a disposition to pronounce everything contraband, has displayed no desire to embrace in her anathemas things financial.

Scarcely had the present war broken out when Russia placed at Paris a loan of over $154,000,000. The Russian Government did not begin by informing the French Government of its intention. It first opened up negotiations with bankers and other financiering institutions, and, when all was concluded, then the French Minister of Finance was told of the operation. But he had no ground for complaint. It is not the French Government which has lent Russia money. French capitalists, great and small, find it to their advantage to invest their funds in Russian bonds, quite without any official pressure from the French Government.

It was not in order to be agreeable to Russia that, about 1887, Bismarck boycotted Russian securities in Berlin. And yet, by so doing, he rendered the Russian Government a service for which it cannot be too thankful. He forced Russia to seek elsewhere for future loans. Baron von Morhenheim, then the Russian Ambassador to Paris, easily proved to his government that there was but one centre where it could find what was needed, and that this centre was Paris.

It is universally known that France is a great storehouse for money. It has long had solid fortunes. The statistics concerning

direct taxation show eight and a half million property-holders. If we take four as the average size of each French family, we find that 34 million French people have real estate, in great or small quantities, directly or indirectly, out of the whole 39 millions of inhabitants, or 872 persons for every 1000.

Perhaps there is some exaggeration in the generalization that all Frenchmen are economical. But it is certain that the peasant likes to hoard up, the domestic puts by and the working-man is often a wage-earner in the city and a landowner in the country; that, in cities like Lyons and Lille, there is a considerable mass of accumulated wealth. It was declared recently that a certain citizen of Lyons, who had an income of 800,000 francs and had spent in one year 30,000 francs, or 6,000 more than the interest at 3 per cent. on his income, considered himself "foolishly reckless!"

This Lyonese Harpagon simply represented the exaggeration of the spirit of capitalization. But it must be admitted that the tendency to save, when carried to excess, is harmful. The small French capitalist always wishes to make "sure investments." This is his ambition; and yet he sometimes lets his imagination run away with his judgment and invests in schemes of a lottery nature, like that of Panama. Suez had enriched certain persons, and the example was cited in favor of the new venture. So, many small capitalists rushed into the enterprise, and disaster overtook them. This crash coincided with the appearance on the Paris market of the Russian bonds. The Panama disaster turned people with money to invest towards State securities and Russian bonds were benefited by this state of public opinion.

The banks that had the placing of the loan got enormous commissions, and it was thus possible for them to influence opinion, which was not a difficult task, for the public was only too willing to do what was wanted of them. When the Emperor Alexander, father of the present Czar, listened to the French national air—the "Marseillaise" of the Revolution—during Admiral Gervais's visit in 1890, his act was considered by shrewd observers as a first-class advertisement of Russian bonds. The imagination of countless Frenchmen was heated by really childish fancies. The high-sounding word "Alliance" was given to what was in fact only a prosaic military convention, whose purpose was to determine the position and number of troops which

Russia should have on her western frontier. Then the Czar sent Admiral Avellane with his fleet to Toulon. Thereupon, some of my fellow countrymen, and fellow countrywomen too, I should add, seemed to rise to the seventh heaven of delight. They imagined that it was things of this sort which were going to decide the hard-headed Germans to hand us back Alsace and Lorraine. Two more loans in 1894, however, were the only practical results of all these hurrahing demonstrations,—one of 167 and a half million of rubles, and another, in the same year, of 147 millions. Barnum himself would have envied advertisers of this calibre, and advertisements of this sort.

Then there was the small French capitalist who did all he could to render the comedy a greater success. French State bonds were very high, and the interest very low, and conversions were always probable. Russia had immense unexploited wealth; she had always paid her coupons; the price of her bonds might rise. Here, then, is a good investment, which is less risky than those of an industrial nature. This is the way that the small French capitalist looked at the matter, and he forthwith handed over his savings to the houses and bankers who had Russian interests in charge, and who had quite other and very decided reasons for wishing to handle these savings, and convert them into Russian bonds. The result of all this has been that, up to the present moment, France has taken up some eight billions of francs' worth of Russian State securities. This glance at what has happened in the past will help the reader to guess what is likely to happen in the near future.

II.

When the present war broke out, the vast majority of Frenchmen were astounded. The diplomats of most nations had shown but little perspicacity in not foreseeing this eventuality. It was evident, however, that Japan could not suffer indefinitely the dilatory conduct of the Russian Government. That the generally poorly informed "man in the street" should believe that "little Japan" would go on yielding to "big Russia,"—that can be understood. But that men whose business it was to know the resources of the two belligerents should also have held this same opinion,—this is incomprehensible. So, when the cloud burst, France was in consternation, and on February 10th, there was a veritable panic on the Paris Stock Exchange.

It is an old saying in the money-market that the fall in prices reaches the lowest point at the first cannon-shot. But the holders of Russian securities found comfort in repeating to themselves, that the destruction of a part of the Russian fleet was due simply to a surprise; that even if the Russians were beaten on the sea they would certainly triumph on land; that Russia had a big gold-reserve fund, and that she would surely pay the interest on her debt. Furthermore, the great French financial houses did all they could to bolster up Russian bonds. But the stock-brokers were frightened at the large holdings in Russians of some of their clients. So they forced settlements, and the crash of February 20th was the result. From that moment there was no more dealing in Paris with Russian securities. If it is possible to buy Russian bonds, it is impossible to sell them. The stock-broker is master of his own credit, and he now refuses to accept Russian bonds unless the bonds themselves are actually placed in his hands. He even refuses to agree to sell a large sum, declaring that he will be unable to find a buyer.

The transactions of the Paris Stock Exchange are monopolized by seventy stock-brokers, through whose hands must pass all operations in State securities. They decided to suspend all business in future sales in order to keep up to the highest point the prices of Russian bonds. This course, it was said at the time, was recommended by the French Minister of Finance himself, M. Rouvier. But this is a most dangerous proceeding. Bears to-day are bulls to-morrow; and if they do not find buyers, a crash is inevitable. The Paris Stock Exchange is at present in a condition when such a thing may happen at any moment.

When, last spring, the latest Russian loan, for 300 millions of rubles, was negotiated at Paris, M. Rouvier feared lest small bondholders should sell their French securities and those Russian securities which they already possessed, in order to buy the new five-per-cents. So he required that the denomination of the bonds should be 500 francs, which would prevent small purses from buying them, and he also cut down the loan to one-half the original amount,—150 stead of 300 million rubles. But this last restriction was overridden, and the banks accepted subscriptions covering the loan several times over. These same bankers, however, were very careful to keep none of the bonds for themselves, and generously ceded all to their clients. They even

went further in their generosity and some of the more important financial establishments shared their commission with these clients in order that the latter might "get all the possible benefit" of the transaction. Clerks, too, in the branch banks of these large houses got a small commission for every bond they succeeded in working off. A small depositor going to one of these banks at this time with a fifty-franc bill in his hand was sure to be importuned by one of these eager employees to invest in the loan. "Buy Russians" was the advice heard on every hand. The reader may judge from this how the next Russian loan will fare when the inevitable moment comes to place it in France.

Nobody knows exactly how Russian finances are administered, as they are not in any way under the control of a representative assembly. The Russian Ministers and officials may present the budget in any way they like. Nobody can tell, consequently, how large or small a part of this latest loan ever actually got into the Russian treasury. The "*Eclair*" newspaper of Paris has disclosed that 30 millions out of the 800 millions of francs were eaten up in commissions. It was first announced that the rate of emission would be 98 francs, which at 5 per cent., would mean an investment at 5.10 per cent. But according to a statement which appeared in the London "Times" of September 15th last, the transaction really cost the Russian Government 6 per cent.

Notwithstanding all the efforts made to prevent it, some of the French holders of Russian bonds sold those which they already had, in order to buy the new ones which were more advantageous. The French bondholder argued in this wise: "This is an investment at more than 5 per cent. That is all I see in it. As Russia is sure to come out ahead on land, she can wait for the day of victory. In the mean time, I will enjoy my larger income. That is all that concerns me."

Consequently, when the news came of Russian defeats on the Yalu and at Liao-Yang, Frenchmen who looked at matters in that way—and their number is legion—were suddenly awakened from a pleasant dream. But thereupon the Russophile newspapers in Paris, more or less inspired by the bankers who placed the loan, began to say and repeat: "The Russians may be beaten at first, but they will win in the end. The finances of Japan will be exhausted before those of Russia."

It is quite true that the credit of Japan is not equal, even now,

after all that has happened, to that of Russia. The small loan which the former asked for was issued at a rate much higher than that of Russia, and it had to be guaranteed by the earnings of the Japanese customs. But Japan has one great superiority over Russia,—she has but four foreign loans. The sum set aside for the payment of the Japanese debt for the year ending March 31, 1904, was 42,402,000 yen, the yen being about 50 cents. The sum set aside for the payment of the Russian debt was estimated for 1904 at 289,299,000 rubles for a capital of 6,629 millions of rubles. But this figure is only approximative, as the various Russian loans are not all given in rubles.

Another question which is sure to be asked by the foreign money-lender when Russia comes forward for a fresh loan is this: "What is the war costing the two nations?" And the answer to this question ought not to help Russia to find buyers of her future bonds. For these inquisitive inquirers will learn that the army and navy of Japan, which have shown what they can do, cost less than the army and navy of any other country. The Japanese army requires less than 20 millions of dollars per year, while that of Russia requires 200 millions. As regards the navy, the figures are 15 millions for Japan and more than 60 millions for Russia. It will also be asked how this money was spent; and then this question will be put by inquisitive investors: "Are all the resources of Russia which are now used for war purposes being so employed as to obtain a maximum result at a minimum cost?" The London "Times," on the date already given, ventures to doubt this, "when the authorities of high standing charge their government with the cost of the best Welsh steam coal and ship inferior Japanese, making thousands on the transaction."

The cost of the war between Japan and China is known. The former country spent $144,000 per day. It is estimated that she is now spending $250,000 per day or, in round numbers, $7,500,000 per month. During the Chinese war, Japan's total expense, from 1894 to November, 1896, was 200,479,508 yen, of which sum 35,955,000 went to the navy. Japan met this demand on her finances by public loans amounting to 116,804,000 yen, while the Chinese indemnity furnished 78,957,000. The monthly maximum of war expenses for Japan never rose to 20,000,000 yen, and, according to the "Times," this average was not exceeded during the first six months of the present conflict.

Now how is Russia faring from this same point of view? She has practically lost her Port Arthur squadron. An authority, M. Raphael Georges Lévy, who is very friendly to Russia, estimates the monthly cost of the war for Russia at between 30 and 40 millions of dollars. This is probably a fair estimate, for England spent about 24 millions of dollars per month during the Transvaal struggle.

These facts must be beginning to be known to the general public. They are certainly well known in all financial circles, and the knowledge of them cannot improve the borrowing possibilities of Russia. And the longer the war lasts, and the more she will need money, the harder it will be for her to find any money anywhere.

III.

At the beginning of September it was rumored that Russia was trying to find money at Berlin. The German Government took a deep interest in the effort, and the Kaiser could not be too zealous in encouraging Russia to keep up the war. He has every reason for wishing Russia to exhaust her arsenals, soldiers and funds. The weakness of Russia is one of the coefficients of the strength of Germany. To render it possible for her to continue the war by increasing her debt, is one of the services most advantageous to Germany that the latter can offer the former. However, towards the middle of September it was announced that the Berlin bankers did not see their way to accommodating Russia, and so the Government of the Czar was forced to again turn to France.

In spite of the efforts to attenuate the result of the battle of Liao-Yang, this event has not strengthened the credit of Russia either in France or elsewhere. Without doubt, Russia can still make a loan at Paris, but its success will depend on two things,—the amount of the proposed loan and the interest rate. Now, if this rate is too high, it will bring about the crash of which mention was made a moment ago. The present holders of Russian State Rente bonds would sell them in order to buy the new ones. In this way another loan could be floated. But could she float two? That is the question. For a loan now to carry on the war will have to be followed by another to meet the final expenses and the indemnity which Japan is sure to exact and to exact quite justly. Or one very large loan might be offered which

would meet both of these needs. But this is the view that the capitalist will take of the matter: "If the new loan," he will argue, "assures Russia the victory, well and good. But if it simply aids in prolonging the struggle, it will also simply weaken Russia still further. The conflict cannot last indefinitely. But the longer it goes on, the greater will be the exigencies of Japan. The Japanese will demand a war indemnity; and then Russia will have to borrow again, and at what rate?" These prudent considerations will not render easier the placing of the future loan.

But the gravest thing about Russia's financial position, from the borrowing point of view, is the fact that she can find but one lender, who has already let her have too much. I, of course, mean France. So, if Paris fails, the St. Petersburg government cannot look elsewhere for outside help. Then the Czar must sink or swim with his own people. But money must be found somewhere and somehow to pay the interest on the immense foreign debt. Gold must be had, and if the French will not loosen their purse-strings, being tired of the thing, then the only recourse left Russia is to begin to use her gold reserve which was accumulated by M. Wischnegradsky, formerly Minister of Finance, and M. de Witte, in order to make it possible to return to specie payment. According to Russian data, there was circulating in Russia, at the end of 1903, 787 millions of gold rubles, and 1,058 other millions were in the vaults of the Bank and the Treasury—a grand total of 920 millions of dollars. On August 1, of this year, the funds in the Bank and the gold in the Treasury were valued at 1,220 millions of rubles.

In two articles published in the important Berlin periodical, the "Deutsche Rundschau," Herr Tankscher concludes that Russia's financial condition is very healthy. But she can keep intact this reserve fund only by borrowing in foreign parts, and, if the day comes when she has to touch this fund, on that day Russian credit will receive a severe blow. It was to prevent this that Russia offered the 800 million francs loan, already mentioned.

The wealth of a country, however, is not based alone on its stock of money. Its industrial and agricultural capacity counts for something. But the present agricultural outlook in Russia is not encouraging. In August, one of the leading Russian dailies, the "Novoye Vremya," stated that in several of the northern provinces lack of forage was causing a large emigration towards

the richer provinces of the south. Within the memory of man the movement had never been so marked. In the Province of Novgorod, the ruined farmers were selling their cattle, in order to keep from starving. But the south itself has only fair crops this year.

M. Bunge, formerly Russian Minister of Finance, has admitted that the peasants cannot pay all their taxes. At the recent birth of the heir to the throne, the Czar issued an edict adjourning still further the payment of these back taxes. We are told that the peasants' land is distinguished from that of the nobles by the quantity and appearance of the harvest. The latter practise agriculture with machines and on approved modern methods, while the former plough, sow and reap as did their ancestors, paying no attention to the laws of the rotation of crops or any other of the teachings of scientific agriculture. The result is that, if we place the peasant's harvest at 100, the noble's rises to 210.

The situation is scarcely more brilliant if we turn towards the industrial field. M. de Witte was long bent on encouraging manufactures, with two results which he probably did not foresee. He has created revolutionary centres formed of the workmen in the factories, and weak industrial concerns which count on the Government to help them out. Without State aid, they cannot live. The Government pays these houses fifty or sixty per cent. more for articles which would otherwise be bought across the frontier. This is where goes a large part of the money borrowed with so much trouble in foreign countries. So the Russian manufacturer naturally looks upon the present war as a perfect godsend.

But the longer the Russian Government prolongs the war, the more it will ruin the country, and it is not without anxiety that this eventuality is viewed by the French holders of Russian securities. Their faith in the triumph of Russia has been rudely shaken by the falsehoods sent broadcast over the world by the official newsmongers of St. Petersburg. French observers are asking how it happens that the Russian War Office always knows the Japanese losses but never their own. The continuous "orderly retreat" in Manchuria reminds them of what happened during the dark days of 1870-1871, and "the plan of Kuropatkin" resembles very closely that of the famous Trochu. The bluff of

the sailing of the Baltic fleet has caused more than one of my countrymen to say: "Really, the Russians must think us asses!" Credit is a matter of faith. When faith departs, credit goes with it.

I have stated that Russia has no other lender than France. It is true that the Dutch hold some Russian bonds, but the phlegmatic Hollanders would not listen an instant to the idea of taking up a Russian loan. Belgium has already lost more than 100 million dollars in closing out, in 1901, her connection with Russia's industrial enterprises, and she would not risk having her fingers burnt again. Of course, the door of England is shut tight, and I doubt if that of New York is likely to open, notwithstanding the Malachite service which the Czar has so seductively presented to the Stock Exchange. The cold shoulder given in Berlin, as just described, removes Germany from the list. France, then, alone remains, as I have already said. But we have seen that even in France the matter is beset with difficulties. The situation, then, may be summed up in these words: Within a brief period, Russia will be forced to draw on its gold reserve and go back to fiat money.

YVES GUYOT.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.*

BY SIR ROBERT FINLAY, K.C., M.P., ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR GREAT BRITAIN.

THE theoretical interest of the subject of International Arbitration is great, its literature enormous; it has been intimately associated in the past with ambitious schemes of international control, and with speculations, some of which seem to us nowadays very fantastic. Its history reaches back to the earliest times of classical antiquity and runs through the Middle Ages; and in our own time the subject has assumed proportions little dreamt of half a century ago. It has a great practical interest; for, with some necessary limitations, there is no doubt that Arbitration is destined to play an increasing part in the history of nations.

The establishment of the permanent Tribunal at The Hague has been an object-lesson for the world. It was, indeed, a striking spectacle that was presented at The Hague last November. In that picturesque little capital, so rich in historical associations, and where at every turn one is reminded of the mighty dead, were gathered together the representatives of eleven different nations, of various races and languages, from the Old World and the New, for the purpose of submitting their differences to the friendly arbitrament of the Tribunal which will be forever associated with the name of The Hague.

It was said by Franklin: "We make daily great improvements in natural, there is one I wish to see in moral, philosophy, the discovery of a plan which will induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats." It was in the year 1780 that Franklin wrote these words, and his language seems to imply that the remedy which he longed for had not yet been found. It is, indeed, a remarkable fact that International Arbitration, as a means of preventing those sanguinary methods

* Copyright, 1904, by Horace Markley.

which he deprecated, had fallen into almost complete disuse in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its efficacy had, however, been proved long before the time of Franklin, though it must be admitted that the method which he desiderated of obliging nations so to settle their differences is still to seek.

It is not surprising that among the communities of ancient Greece the necessity for some mode of peaceful solution of disputes should have been realized. The country was divided among a large number of petty States, allied, indeed, by blood, by language, by religion, by association in the national games, by a common contempt for their barbarian neighbors, but frequently at war with one another—war which would have been perpetual had there been no means of adjusting the disputes which were constantly arising. Thucydides puts into the mouth of a Spartan king the sentiment that it is not lawful to treat as a wrong-doer one who is ready to arbitrate, and what we should call an arbitration clause was a common feature in Greek treaties. Greek histories present many instances of recourse to arbitration. Sometimes the arbitrator selected was a friendly State; sometimes one who had attained the distinction which was most prized in Greece, that of winner at the Olympic Games; sometimes the Delphic Oracle.

Accounts have come down to us of the earliest, perhaps, of those arbitrations, which took place about six hundred years B.C. One of those wars so frequent in the history of Greece, insignificant in their scale, but romantic in their incidents, and often fraught with grave issues for the future of the world, had broken out between Athens and Megara. Each claimed the right to the possession of an island bearing a name which was destined to become immortal, Salamis. The war languished, and the Athenians became so weary of it that they are said to have passed a law condemning to death any one who proposed that it should be renewed. But the possession of Salamis was to Athens a matter of life and death. There was one man, and one only, in Athens, who saw this clearly, Solon, the law-giver. I need not recall the picturesque stratagem by which he is said to have goaded his countrymen into action, without incurring the penalty of the law. The war was resumed, and when it had gone on for a long time both sides agreed to refer the dispute to the decision of five Lacedæmonian arbitrators, whose names have been preserved by Plutarch. The arbi-

trators rose above all racial questions, and adjudged the island to Athens.

There was one celebrated institution in ancient Greece which has been regarded by some authors as intrusted with the function not merely of inducing, but of compelling, submission to arbitration. The Amphictyonic Council has been spoken of as *commune Graeciae consilium,* as the States-General of Greece, as clothed with power to decide upon disputes between States and to enforce its decisions. But little trace is to be found in history of its exercise of any such exalted functions. The Amphictyonic League was a confederacy of races dating from the earliest times, and ultimately embracing the most powerful of the Greek States. It was in its essential features a religious association, formed for the protection of the temples of Apollo and Demeter. One of the aims of the confederacy was to mitigate the horrors of war between the various States which it embraced. The quaint form of oath has been preserved by Æschines. By it the members swore that they would never destroy an Amphictyonic town, that they would never cut it off from running water, either in peace or in war, and that if any one made spoil of the treasure of the god, they would punish him with hand and foot and voice and all their might.

For the enforcement of its decrees the Amphictyonic Council, like the Pope when he intervened in the disputes of princes in the Middle Ages, had at its disposal only spiritual weapons. To be excluded from the Pythian Games and the Temple at Delphi was a sentence of excommunication. But the Council from time to time called in the aid of the secular arm, and it made a memorable and disastrous contribution to Greek history by the part it played in accelerating the subjugation of Greece by invoking the aid of Philip of Macedon in the third and fourth Sacred Wars.

Two curious instances of submission to the arbitration of the Amphictyonic Council are recorded, but it did little, if anything, in the way of promoting peace among the communities of Greece. *Stat magni nominis umbra.*

To the history of International Arbitration the Romans contributed little or nothing. While they were making their conquests, they were little disposed to submit their claims to any arbitrament but that of the god of battles. They were never troubled with any doubts as to the justice of their wars. Cases

justifying the verdict, "*Eas res puro pioque duello repetundas censeo,*" were, as Hallam says, prodigiously frequent in the opinion of the Romans. When their conquests had been completed, there were no nations left to arbitrate with. The *Pax Romana* reigned everywhere, and the Senate or Cæsar was its supreme arbiter.

There is, indeed, one institution, dating from the earliest times of Roman history, the importance of which, as bearing on International Arbitration and International Law, has been much exaggerated. Some modern authors have found in the *Fetiales* a permanent tribunal of Arbitration between Rome and other nations, to whose decision, based on the principles of International Law, was referred the question of the justice or the injustice of every war before it was undertaken. Bossuet speaks of them as a holy institution, which puts to shame those Christians into whom even their religion has not been able to inspire charity and peace. A distinguished modern author on International Law (Calvo) says: "Among the Romans no war was declared without the intervention of the *Fetiales,* whose principal mission, according to Plutarch, was not to permit hostilities before every hope of obtaining arbitration was extinguished."

It has, however, been shrewdly remarked that there is not a single instance in Roman history in which the *Fetiales* pronounced unjust any war on which their country was bent. Their real function was that of fulfilling those curious formalities in the declaration of war and in the conclusion of peace, which to the Roman mind were so essential. It is on the points of form only that we find them consulted, and the *Jus Fetiale,* which some have supposed to be synonymous with International Law, was in fact concerned only with its procedure. Whatever the origin of the institution, its function was but to lend the sanction of form to that upon which the Senate and the people of Rome had determined.

The greatness of Rome and the permanence of her empire formed the inspiration of the greatest of Roman poets. In his majestic lines we still can realize that passion of empire which ennobled the Roman race.

> "Now, thy Forum roars no longer,
> Fallen every purple Cæsar's dome—
> Tho' thine ocean-roll of rhythm
> Sound forever of Imperial Rome."

Even after "the fierce giants of the North" had broken in, men could not believe that the Empire of Rome had indeed come to an end. They had believed it eternal, and its traditions were transferred to Emperors elected beyond the Alps.

That the Emperor was, indeed, the heir of all the prerogatives of Imperial Rome was throughout the Middle Ages assumed as too clear for argument. In that most curious of treatises, "*De Monarchiâ*," Dante devotes himself to proving that there must be one Sovereign or Emperor supreme above all others; that God had given the sovereignty of the world to the people of Rome; and that the Emperor, as wielding that authority, was independent of the Pope.

In Dante's view universal monarchy is necessary for the good of mankind. He argues that there must be some means of deciding, and deciding authoritatively, controversies between different States. "It is manifest," he says, "that there may be controversy between any two princes where the one is not subject to the other, either from the fault of themselves or even of their subjects. Therefore, between them there should be means of judgment; and since, when one is not subject to the other, he cannot be judged by the other (for there is no rule of equals over equals), there must be a third power of wider jurisdiction within the circle of whose laws both may come. . . . We must come to that judge who is first and highest, by whose judgments all controversies must be directly or indirectly decided, and he will be Monarch or Emperor. Monarchy is, therefore, necessary to the world, and this the philosopher saw when he said, 'The world is not intended to be disposed in evil order; in a multitude of rulers there is evil, therefore let there be one Prince.'"

In establishing the right of the people of Rome to universal dominion, Dante assumed that he had established the same right as still existing in the Emperor.

The Emperor was no mere arbitrator whose jurisdiction reposed upon consent. His claim was that he stood above all other kings of Europe, and was entitled to regulate and coerce them. "Placed in the midst of Europe," says Mr. Bryce, "the Emperor was to bind its tribes into one body, reminding them of their common faith, their common blood, their common interest in each other's welfare. And he was therefore above all things, professing, indeed, to be upon earth the representative of the Prince of

Peace, bound to listen to complaints, and to redress the injuries inflicted by sovereigns and peoples upon each other, to punish offenders against the public order of Christendom; to maintain throughout the world, looking down as from a serene height upon the schemes and quarrels of meaner potentates, that supreme good without which neither arts nor letters, nor the gentler virtues of life can rise and flourish."

It was a noble dream, but it never was translated into fact. A vague predominance among the princes of Europe was indeed accorded to the Emperor, but his claims were merely the afterglow of that sun of Roman Empire which had set forever. The influence of the Holy Roman Empire dwindled, until in the eighteenth century Voltaire but expressed the sentiment of Europe, when he said that it was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire.

Much more real than the majestic, but shadowy, pretensions of the Empire was the influence exerted in mediæval Europe by the Papacy. The Pope claimed to be the supreme judge among kings, not by consent, but as of right. These claims play a great part in the history of the Middle Ages. They were sometimes acquiesced in, sometimes resisted. They were never resisted with more spirit than by the Parliament of Scotland, held at Aberbrothock in the year 1320, after the Pope had issued a Bull in support of the pretensions of Edward II. to the sovereignty of Scotland. The reply of the Scottish Parliament was couched in a strain of unusual vigor. They informed the Pope that, if he encouraged the English in their aggression, he would be held responsible to God for the loss of life which would ensue; for, said this memorable document, "as long as a hundred Scotsmen are left alive, we will never be subject to the dominion of England."

Instances are not wanting in which the Pope was, by consent of the parties, selected as arbitrator to decide international disputes, but he assumed a jurisdiction far transcending that of a mere arbitrator. The most celebrated instance of this is to be found in the Bull by which Alexander VI., in 1493, drew an imaginary line from one pole to the other, and by it divided between Spain and Portugal the territory discovered in the New World. Towards the close of the eighteenth century, this Bull was urged by Spain in support of her pretensions to the northwest coast of America, including the territory which formed recently the subject of the Alaska Arbitration — pretensions

which culminated in the seizure, in 1789, of British vessels at Nootka Sound, and brought the two countries to the verge of war. At the end of the nineteenth century, in the Arbitration as to the frontiers of Venezuela and British Guiana, one of the arguments in favor of Venezuela was based on this Bull, as a judicial decision by the Supreme Judge of Christendom.

"During the Middle Ages," it was said in the Venezuelan Counter case, "and until after the discovery of America, the Pope was the recognized arbiter of the civilized world. His word was in those days supreme." But, on the other hand, only thirty years after it was issued this Bull was treated with scant respect by the King of France, Francis I. "What!" he said, "the King of Spain and the King of Portugal quietly divide between them all America, without allowing me, as their brother, to take a share! I should much like to see the article in Adam's will which gives them this vast inheritance."

By the beginning of the seventeenth century the influence of the Papacy as the arbiter of Europe had waned. The controlling power claimed for the Holy Roman Empire had never been a reality. Europe had been devastated by religious and dynastic wars. If any check was to be placed on the ambition of princes, and the animosities of nations, it appeared that it could be found only in a federation of the States of Europe. Such was the governing idea of the great plan which at the time of his death engaged the attention of Henry IV., the greatest soldier and statesman of his age, the best beloved of French kings, whose memory is still green in the hearts of his people.

The vast possessions of the House of Austria, in Spain, in Italy, in Germany, and in the Low Countries, had excited the jealousy of all other European Powers, and it was feared that the dream of universal monarchy might be converted into a reality. Henry proposed, in the first place, to break effectually the power of the House of Austria, and to strip it of all its possessions in Europe except Spain. For this purpose a great confederacy had been organized. Henry himself was about to take the field, when, in a moment, the dagger of Ravaillac changed the future of Europe. But the destruction of the House of Austria was to have been only the first step in the execution of the *grand dessein*, as it is given to us in full detail in that most fascinating of books, the Memoirs of Henry's great minister, Sully. When this first

and necessary step had been taken, there was to be formed a sort of Republic of Christendom, consisting of all the States of Europe under the headship of the Emperor—so much force was there still in the tradition of the Holy Roman Empire. The object was, as Sully tells us, to deliver the nations from the crushing burden of military expenditure, to prevent those bloody wars which had desolated Europe, to establish peace, and to unite the States of the Republic of Christendom in an indissoluble bond.

That Republic was to consist of fifteen States—six hereditary kingdoms, France, Spain, England, Denmark, Sweden and Lombardy: five elective, the Empire, the Papacy, Poland, Hungary and Bohemia: and four republics, Venice, Italy, Switzerland and the Low Countries. The Emperor was to be the head and first magistrate of this Republic of States. A Senate, moulded on the Amphictyonic Council, consisting of seventy deputies from the fifteen Powers, was to sit at some central point, to consult on the interests of Christendom, to arrange disputes, and to settle all the affairs, civil, political and religious, of Europe, in its relations with Powers in other parts of the world. The confederacy of Europe was to have an army of 270,000 infantry, and 50,000 cavalry, and Henry had settled in his own mind the quota which was to be supplied by each State. This army was not to remain idle, for the Turk was to be driven out of Europe, and it is interesting to recall that the imagination of Henry as a boy had been fired by the victory of Don John at Lepanto, and that one of his famous ten wishes was to win a battle in person against the King of Spain, and another against the Sultan.

The kingdom of Prussia as yet did not exist, and the Electorate of Brandenburg, out of which so much has grown, was not of sufficient consequence to deserve any special mention by Sully among the States of the Republic of Christendom.

Spain was to be compensated for the loss of her other possessions in Europe, by having assigned to her whatever she might desire to take in the three remaining Continents of the World. There was to be no colonial empire but that of Spain. So far, indeed, was Sully from having any vision of Britain beyond the seas, and of an empire greater than that of Spain ever was, that he speaks of the British Isles as if they were a sort of continent by themselves, in which their people might dwell quiet and secure, having no business with any man, and minding their own affairs.

Such schemes of federation have often been propounded by jurists, by philosophers and by poets. This is the single instance in which such a project was seriously entertained by a great King and a great Minister.

Fifteen years after the death of Henry IV. appeared the memorable work of Grotius, the father of International Law. The publication in 1625 of his treatise "*De Jure Belli et Pacis*," made, to use the words of Hallam, an epoch in the philosophical and almost in the political history of Europe. He strenuously advocated arbitration as a means of avoiding war. But he went further, and desired that nations should not only be induced, but also obliged, to settle their differences peaceably. It would be useful, he says, and is almost necessary, that Congresses should be held of Christian Powers, for the decision of controversies and for compelling obedience.

The language of Grotius is sober and measured, but the same can hardly be said of many of the schemes of this sort which have been launched, some of them by men bearing very eminent names. The Abbé de St. Pierre, early in the eighteenth century, proposed a scheme which involved the establishment of an army of the Federation of Europe, which would make war on any sovereign disobeying a judgment of the International Court. On the eve of the commencement of the wars of the French Revolution, Bentham prepared a plan for a universal and permanent peace, with a common tribunal, a reduction of standing armies, and the emancipation of all colonies. When the revolutionary wars were at the hottest, the philosopher Kant put forward a project for a permanent Congress of States, republican constitutions in all countries, and the abolition not only of national armies, but also of national debts.

Many other schemes for national organization have followed. In some of them, every detail has been settled, even to the salaries of the officials.

No such scheme ever has taken, and no such scheme ever will take, its place in the world of realities. Europe has fallen back upon a plan less ambitious but more practicable, arbitration resting on the consent of the parties to the dispute; and we may hope that its adoption, though it never can abolish war, will at least greatly diminish its frequency.

In truth, no International Authority with power to enforce the

decrees of the tribunal of arbitration is either necessary or desirable. The list of international arbitrations during the nineteenth century is a very long one; and yet there is hardly a single case in which there has been any difficulty as to compliance with the award. In the Alabama Arbitration, a sum was awarded to the United States so enormous that it is reported that to the present day the American Government has not been able to find claimants for all of it. Sir Alexander Cockburn, the distinguished representative of Great Britain upon the Geneva Tribunal, dissented in the strongest terms from that award. But Great Britain never dreamt of refusing to comply with it. The enforcement of awards may safely be left to the good faith of the parties, and the honor of nations. There is no necessity for any International Sheriff's Officer.

Submission to arbitration must rest upon the free consent of the nations concerned. The establishment of an International Tribunal before which any State might sue another, would be a measure of very doubtful utility. Litigation of this sort between nations would probably cause more friction than it would prevent. As between individuals, there must be power to take one another to law: but the process, however necessary, is not one which is usually found to conduce to friendly feeling between the litigants. One of the highest compliments ever paid to a judge was that he was able to send away even those against whom he had decided *aequos placatosque*—the merit of the achievement was measured by the difficulty of the task. A compulsory tribunal, before which any nation might be haled by any other to answer claims which it might consider unfounded and frivolous, would, indeed, be a dangerous experiment. But a tribunal whose jurisdiction rests entirely upon consent stands on a different footing altogether, and experience has shown that nations which meet in the amicable contest of voluntary arbitration are all the better friends for it.

The powers to be conferred upon International arbitrators may vary indefinitely according to the terms of submission. Sometimes, as in the Behring Sea Arbitration, their functions are limited to deciding on questions of International Law and of strict right. Sometimes, as in the arbitration as to the boundary of British Guiana and Venezuela, they have conferred upon them a larger discretion, with power to say what is fair to be done. If

such larger functions be intrusted to the tribunal, there are some questions dealt with in the past by Congresses, which may in the future be disposed of by arbitration. But International Arbitration can never altogether supersede International Congresses. Their spheres are different. If questions of large and general policy have to be settled between nations they may find it expedient to meet in Congress. Machinery which is admirably adapted for solving questions of right in particular cases, is not suited for settling such wider problems. As their spheres are different, so are their methods. The methods of the tribunal of arbitration are judicial. There meet in friendly rivalry the Bars of the countries concerned, and the award is the judgment of a Court. The methods of the Congress are diplomatic. It was said by an eye-witness of the Congress of Vienna, that a kingdom was partitioned or augmented at a ball, an indemnity was granted at a dinner, a constitution was projected at a *battue;* that sometimes a *bon mot* or a happy remark concluded a Treaty which would hardly have been brought to pass by many conferences and long correspondence.

But, beneficial as is the rôle of Arbitration, there are some questions which no country will consent to leave to the judgment of any Court or any arbitrator. Every nation must be the guardian of its own honor. Every nation must decide for itself questions vitally affecting its independence or its essential interests. Some stakes are too big for arbitration. Some issues are too tremendous to be submitted to any but the dread ordeal of battle. It has been said that there hardly ever was a good war, and hardly ever a bad peace. But there are sometimes greater evils than war. There are some conclusions to which no nation ought to submit until everything has been staked and lost.

The United States are a Federation of a peculiarly intimate type, and have always possessed, in their magnificent institution of the Supreme Court, a tribunal, described by John Stuart Mill as international, for the decision of questions arising between the different States. Yet, when the great question of the rights of these States as against the Central Government arose, it could be settled only by the gigantic War of the Secession. In the sublime language of Bacon, "Wars are suits of appeal to the tribunal of God's Justice, where there are no superiors on earth to determine the case."

But, though war cannot be abolished, the occasions of war may be greatly diminished by International Arbitration. Some wars are inevitable. They result from the collision of great principles or vital interests. Their true causes lie far deeper than the incidents which ostensibly cause the rupture. But, how many wars have there been which, without any such overpowering force behind them, have originated from comparatively small beginnings! When the passions of nations become inflamed, some trivial matter is liable to assume monstrous proportions.

Take two events in our recent history, the dispute over the Alabama claims, and the dispute over the Venezuelan boundary. Either of these might well have led to war. They were both settled by arbitration.

It used to be said that war is the game of kings. But perhaps the greatest danger to peace is that, if there is prolonged controversy over some matter, however insignificant in itself, the feelings and the national pride of the people of each country may be involved to such an extent as to render peaceful solution difficult or impossible. When national animosities have been awakened, any spark may kindle a conflagration. The task of the statesman in averting war is immensely facilitated if he finds ready to his hands the machinery for a peaceful settlement. How many wars might have been averted in the past if there had always been in existence, by the common consent of nations, such a tribunal as that of The Hague, whose open portals invite arbitration.

If it be true that "the sight of means to do ill deeds, makes ill deeds done," it is no less true that the existence of such a permanent tribunal, to which any question may be referred, must make for the cause of peace. The maxim, "*si vis pacem, para bellum*," has a great deal of truth in it; but the very fact that there is ready to hand a great instrument of war may sometimes bring it about. May we not hope that the fact of the existence of this great instrument of peace may remove occasions for war, and that nations will more and more recognize the truth of the weighty words of the great Scottish Jurist, the first Lord Stair: "Kings and States ought not to be both judges and parties, when others can be had; but before they enter into war, they ought to demand satisfaction, ... and not decline arbitration when an independent judge can be had"?

ROBERT FINLAY.

SHOULD THE SAFETY OF EMPLOYEES AND TRAVELLERS ON RAILROADS BE PROMOTED BY LEGISLATION?

BY JOHN J. ESCH, MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WHEN the combined losses of both the Japanese and Russian armies for the five days of awful fighting, from August 26th to the fall of Liao-Yang, was announced to the world as amounting, in killed and wounded, to over 30,000 men, all the world shuddered. When the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its last Annual Report, made public the fact that, for the year ending June 30th, 1903, the passengers and employees killed and injured on the railroads of the United States amounted to a frightful total of 49,531, the statement excited little comment. Wreck has followed wreck with such regularity, during the last twelve months, as to make the reports of them in the daily press no longer sensational, but rather commonplace. This deplorable record of casualties has been on the increase for years; and, for the year ending March 3rd, 1904, it shows 427 passengers killed, 8,006 injured, 3,479 employees killed and 43,025 injured, making a grand total of 54,937, being greater by almost 6,000 than the losses which resulted from the three days' fighting at Gettysburg. It is a concrete illustration such as this which makes us alive to the situation, and inspires the inquiry: "What can and what ought to be done about it?"

As about eighty-four per cent. of the casualties on railroads occur among the employees, and as the coupling of cars and the falling from and riding upon cars have been largely responsible for the deaths and injuries among the employees, Congress was appealed to by them to enact safety-appliance laws for their protection. The agitation began in 1888 by the adoption of resolu-

tions by the Railroad Commissioners of the country, at a meeting held at Washington in the spring of that year, and this was followed up by a petition, signed by about 10,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Brakemen, asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to take steps to bring about "the adoption of automatic couplers and brakes on freight-cars used on the railroads of the United States, and strongly appealing to the Commission to urge upon Congress the necessity of national legislation, that the terrible slaughter of brakemen on the railroads of the country might be diminished."

With the record of 2,000 employees killed and more than 20,000 injured for the year ending June 30th, 1889, with resolutions adopted by all the Grand Lodges of the Railroad Brotherhoods appealing for help, President Harrison was so much impressed that, on December 3rd, 1889, he sent a special message to Congress urging remedial legislation in these words: "It is a reproach to civilization that any class of American workmen, in the pursuit of a necessary and useful vocation, should be subjected to a peril of life and limb as great as that of a soldier in time of war."*

As about forty per cent. of the casualties among employees resulted from coupling cars, or setting brakes, Congress first directed its attention to legislation which would lessen if not obviate these occasions of danger and loss. As a result, the act of March 2nd, 1893, was passed, which sought to relieve brakemen from the necessity of going on top of or between cars, by requiring all railroads engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers, grab-irons or handholds on the ends or sides, and power or train brakes on their locomotives, "with a power driving-wheel brake, and appliances for operating the train-brake system."

Prior to the passage of the above act, various railroad managers, with commendable enterprise and actuated by humane motives, had begun of their own accord to apply different kinds of automatic couplers and brakes on the cars of their respective lines; but trainmen soon discovered that it was as dangerous to use diverse devices as it had been to use the old link and pin. Uniformity of device and of height of draw-bar, not only on each railroad system, but on all systems engaged in interstate traffic,

* O'Neill's Report, First Session Forty-second Congress.

was found necessary. Such uniformity could only come through Congressional action. The above act, therefore, authorized the American Railway Association through its experts to recommend a standard height of draw-bar for freight-cars for each of the several gauges in use in the United States.

To further safeguard brakemen or trainmen, and to prevent the necessity of their going on top of the cars, day or night, or in any weather, Congress, by an act approved March 2nd, 1903, required that not less than fifty per cent. of the cars in a train operated with power or train brakes "shall have their brakes used and operated by the engineer of the locomotive drawing such train, and all power-braked cars in such trains which are associated together with said fifty per centum shall have their brakes so used and operated." The act of March 2nd, 1893, originally limited the commencement of its operation to January 1st, 1898, but the time was subsequently extended to August 1st, 1900. The act of March 2nd, 1903, became operative on September 1st, 1903. Anticipating the former law, some of the leading roads began installing the safety appliances which it prescribed shortly after its passage. As these are the only statutes enacted by Congress to promote the safety of railroad employees, it is pertinent to inquire whether they have been successful or not. If successful, Congress, in view of the deplorable disasters of the last twelve months, might wisely undertake legislation to promote the safety of passenger traffic.

Statistics filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission show, making a comparison by years, "that, while the number killed and injured compared with the total employees has changed very little, the proportionate number of trainmen killed by coupling and uncoupling was reduced one-half between 1893 and 1896, a slight increase over 1896 being shown for 1900; and the number injured, decreased one-fifth between 1893 and 1896, was reduced one-half between 1893 and 1900. A like change of proportion is to be noted for switchmen, flagmen, etc. Deaths by falling from trains and engines have been materially decreased, but injuries from that cause have remained about the same. . . . On the whole it may be claimed, then, that the Federal law of 1893 has had a decided effect in decreasing accidents in the departments to which it applies."*

*Industrial Commission, Vol. 19, pages 914-915.

Notwithstanding these satisfactory results, the fact that for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1904, there were 104 trainmen killed and 1,358 wounded, in coupling and uncoupling cars, indicates that the acts of Congress passed for the benefit of trainmen have not had full fruition. While some allowance should be made for the enormous increase in freight traffic since 1900, which has resulted in the employment of many inexperienced men, Government inspectors report that there has been a lax compliance with the provisions of the safety-appliance law on the part of many railroad officials; that, while standard brakes and couplers may have been fully installed, there has been neglect in keeping them in constant repair, especially as to the gauging of couplers, the uncoupling apparatus, the retaining valve on the air-brakes, and the slighting of repairs on foreign cars.

That the fullest protection to trainmen as intended by Congress may be attained, the Government inspection force, now consisting of only fifteen men, should be largely increased. The inspectors should have power to peremptorily forbid the use of cars, engines or trains not fully equipped as required by law, and the railroads themselves should increase their repair and instruction crews. These things being done, the safety-appliance law will more fully justify itself, and the number of trainmen killed and injured annually will be reduced to a minimum.

Thus far, the safety of trainmen only has been considered. The results of but a short operation of the safety-appliance law have so largely reduced the casualties among trainmen, by obviating the necessity of their going between or on top of the cars, that it may next be asked: Can their safety be further promoted by legislation safeguarding them, as well as switch-tenders and other employees, against collisions and derailments, from which causes, for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1904, there were 848 killed and 5,839 injured? Whatever legislation would protect trainmen against collisions and derailments would likewise protect baggagemen, expressmen, railway mail-clerks and the travelling public. Such legislation, therefore, if reasonable and practicable, affecting millions of our people, as it would, is worthy of most careful consideration.

Such legislation should have two objects; first, to afford safety against carelessness, forgetfulness, lack of discipline or faults of omission in general; second, to afford safety in spite of such

carelessness, forgetfulness, lack of discipline and faults of omission. In connection with the first object, a study of the "Quarterly Accident Bulletins" of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1904, being the last statistics obtainable, shows:

Nine collisions, with a total of 38 killed and 35 injured, and property loss of $77,770, caused by excessive hours on duty, and the falling asleep of engine-men, flagmen or operators:

Twelve collisions, with a total of 7 killed and 79 injured, and property loss of $69,255, caused by the employment of young or inexperienced men;

Twelve collisions, with a total of 47 killed and 223 injured, and property loss of $224,924, caused by the misreading of train orders by engine-men and conductors;

Thirteen collisions, with a total of 72 killed and 208 injured, and property loss of $107,037, caused by ignoring signals and disobedience of orders on the part of engine-men, conductors and brakemen.

To the above classification of causes of railroad collisions and derailments may be added those resulting from forgetfulness of orders, misunderstandings as to the right to the track, "overlooking a train," mistakes of operators and despatchers in reading, transmitting or delivering orders. From these latter causes, during the months of April, May and June, 1903, alone, 33 deaths and 260 injuries resulted.

The writer believes that a Federal law, supplemented by State enactments, should be passed, prohibiting, by means of severe penalties, railroad companies from requiring trainmen, or other employees connected with the operation of trains, to work continuously for an excessive number of hours. No demand of traffic, however urgent, should deprive passengers of the service of alert, wakeful and attentive operatives. For like reasons, mere boys should be prohibited from being employed as operators; and men with little or no experience, and ignorant of their duties or of the road, should be prohibited from being employed as flagmen, engine-men, brakemen, or conductors. A thorough apprenticeship, for a specified term, with rigorous tests and examinations, should precede employment, while color-blindness and drunkenness on duty should bar or terminate it.

It may be difficult, if not impossible, to legislate against the

misreading or disobedience of orders, ignoring of signals, and many other causes of railroad accidents. Federal legislation might make some of these acts criminal and punishable with fines and imprisonment, but State laws now render these punishable under different degrees of manslaughter. Ultimately, the best remedy lies in a stricter enforcement of discipline on the part of the officials of the railroads themselves. To lay off an engine-man for a month or two for ignoring or running past a signal, even when no loss results, or a conductor for misreading an order, is not a punishment, but a vacation. This stricter discipline, promoting, as it will, the safety of life and limb, should be enforced irrespective of the demands of labor-unions in behalf of their members, on the one hand, or the officious interference of railroad officials, on the other.

The employees on American railroads are intelligent, capable and well organized. The officials who manage and operate these roads are ambitious, resourceful and, as a rule, progressive; and yet, to both, a record of such numerous and costly wrecks as have happened within a year should come as a reproach. A few of the most disastrous wrecks, with causes, are here set forth:

December 23rd, 1903, near Connellsville, Pa., 65 killed and 4 wounded. The track was obstructed by timbers which had fallen from a car insecurely loaded.

December 27th, 1903, near Grand Rapids, Mich., 18 killed and 57 injured. The engine-man passed a station at which he should have stopped for a despatcher's order. He claimed that the signal had been blown out by a high wind.

January 6th, 1904, near Topeka, Kansas, 18 killed and 37 injured. The train passed the station without stopping. The conductor and engine-man did not correctly identify a freight-train met at the station.

July 12th, 1904, at Midvale, N. J., 17 killed and 50 injured. A collision between passenger and excursion trains, caused by a tower-man's lowering his signal too soon.

July 13th, 1904, at Glenwood, Ill., 24 killed and 72 wounded. The passenger-train collided with a freight-train which should have remained on a side track.

August 8th, 1904, near Eden, Col., 100 killed (estimated). A bridge over a dry run gave way as a result of a sudden flood.

September 24th, 1904, near Newmarket, Tenn., 62 killed and

over 100 injured. The crew of the westbound train failed to carry out its orders to meet an eastbound train at a given station.

To these instances might be added scores of minor collisions and derailments, resulting in death and injury to hundreds, and in property losses of over ten millions for the year. Compared with the casualties on English, German, French and Austrian railroads, this record is humiliating, even after full allowance has been made for our greater mileage, more rapid extension of lines, heavier freight traffic and lack of public supervision. But no comparison in the end fixes standards. Neither our railroad officials nor the men they employ should be content until, to the best system in the world, there has been added the best management; and, if some roads have not enough enterprise or initiative to bring about such a consummation, legislation should furnish the spur.

The ideal railway line contemplates the use of the double-track or, what is better, the four-track system. On such a system, head-on or butting collisions, which for the year ending March 31st, 1904, numbered 1,040 and resulted in deaths to 320 and injury to 2,792, would become rare, if not impossible. Such collisions, because of the greater speed and momentum of the colliding trains, entailed for the same year about one-third more deaths and injuries than rear-end collisions, although there were 862 more of the latter. It would be idle, and in some cases ruinous and impracticable, to compel by legislation, either State or national, the construction of double-track or multiple-track systems. That is an improvement which time, increase of business and enterprise must be left to bring about.

The legislation thus far suggested as practicable and necessary for the safety of employees and the travelling public would not entail much expense upon the roads, beyond such expense as would follow an increase in the number of the force; but the compulsory installation by law of the so-called "block-signal system," as an efficient aid to the safety of travel, would mean large expenditure. In this connection, it is first necessary to determine whether this system has proven itself to be efficient, and, if so, whether through Congressional action the railroads of the country should be obliged to install it at such times and with such rapidity and on such portions of the line as Congress might prescribe.

The block-signal system is no new device. Progressive roads

in this country and abroad have made use of it for years. There are at the present over thirty thousand miles, equal to about one-seventh of the total mileage, of American roads equipped with it, embracing the parts of most roads where freight and passenger traffic is heaviest. Ever since Judge Cooley was Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, that Commission has called attention to the efficacy of the block or space system in promoting the safety of railroad travel, and has repeatedly urged legislation to install it. The argument has recently been made that "the installation of the block-signal system on nearly thirty thousand miles of the busiest railways of the United States fails to show any appreciable effect in reducing the total of casualties." Granting this to be true, who can state how many more casualties there might have been had such system not been installed. For the year ending June 30th, 1902, ten out of eleven of the worst collisions occurred on roads not using the block system. Great Britain has been making use of it universally for years past, and to its use may be largely ascribed the remarkable fact that not a single passenger was killed in train accidents in 1901, and only six in 1902. The slow but voluntary extension of this system by some of the leading roads in this country is the best evidence of its efficiency. No system, however perfect, whether automatic or otherwise, can wholly eliminate the human factor in the problem of safety. Trainmen will forget, flagmen and tower-men will fall asleep, repair-men will become negligent, officials will relax discipline, in short some one will blunder; and yet this system is the most practicable method thus far put in use to insure safety.

So satisfactory has been the use of the block-signal system that the Interstate Commerce Commission has felt warranted in recommending to Congress for passage the draft of a bill requiring its use. Recognizing the cost of installation, the bill extends the time of installation over a period of years, that portion of a given line with the heaviest traffic being required to be first attended to. For the purposes of the proposed legislation, the Commission holds "the block system to mean the methods and rules by means of which the movement of railroad trains (cars or engines) may be regulated in such manner that an interval of space of absolute length may, at all times, be maintained between the rear end of a train and the forward end of the train next following."*

* Interstate Commerce Commission, 17 Annual Rept., page 344.

As the double or multiple tracks render head-on or butting collisions less probable, the block system has had the same effect in regard to rear-end collisions. As to the former, legislation to force installation would be in many instances ruinous and unreasonable; as to the latter, it would be wise and ultimately profitable. In support of any law which promotes safety, but which imposes large expenditures on the railroads, there should be offset the lessened costs and damages resulting from the lessened number of wrecks. For the fiscal year ending 1903, the loss from collisions and derailments, exclusive of litigated damages, amounted to over nine and one-half million dollars. With semaphores costing from fifty to seventy-five dollars apiece, wiring twenty-five to thirty-five dollars per mile, and signal-men's cabins five hundred dollars each, many miles of road could annually be fitted out with the block system out of the damage annually sustained by the railroads of the country. The writer firmly believes in the necessity and efficacy of this system and in legislation, both State and Federal, which will require its installation.

The second object of legislation, as already stated, is to provide safety in spite of carelessness, forgetfulness, lack of discipline or faults of omission, and, it might be added, in spite of defects of roadways, equipment and of unforeseen obstructions. This object can be attained by requiring baggage, express, mail, smoking, chair, and tourist cars—in fact, all cars except sleepers—to be so strongly built as to prevent telescoping and destruction by fire in case of collision or derailment or other accidents. It is a well-known fact that, in the average wreck, the passengers in the smoking-car and in the so-called "day coaches" suffer most. In all collisions the casualties are almost wholly confined to these cars and coaches; and, even in rear-end collisions, the force of impact, transmitted through the sleepers, spends itself upon them. The Associated Press reports of some of the worst wrecks in recent years fully attest the truth of these statements.

In the awful wreck at Chatsworth, Illinois, August 10th, 1887, in which 85 were killed, "ten cars, being telescoped, were piled across and on top of the two engines, but no one in the sleepers was hurt."

In the wreck near Tiffin, Ohio, January 4th, 1887, in which 19 were killed and 24 injured, "the crash came, telescoping the coaches and piling them upon each other."

In the wreck near White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, December 28th, 1889, in which 11 were killed and 25 injured, "all killed were in the smoking-car, which was telescoped by another car, every person in the car being killed."

But we can find abundant confirmation in the more important wrecks which have occurred within a year, and which have already been referred to. In the wreck near Connellsville, December 23rd, 1903, "nearly all killed were in the smoking-car. The two Pullman coaches had their trucks knocked from under them, but did not suffer damage otherwise, and none of the passengers were seriously injured."

In the wreck near Grand Rapids, Mich., December 27th, 1903, "the trains met with a terrific crash, the baggage and smoking car on each train being instantly reduced to kindling-wood. . . . No person occupying cars other than the baggage and smoking cars, with very few exceptions, were seriously injured."

In the wreck at Topeka, Kansas, January 6th, 1904, "the smoking-car was overturned and pushed through the car behind it. All the passenger-coaches except the last two Pullman coaches were piled up in a heap."

In the wreck near Midvale, N. J., July 12th, 1904, "the engine of the regular train pierced the rear car of the excursion train the greater part of its length, and drove the front end of the car into the car ahead. The killed and injured were in these two cars."

In the recent bad wreck near Glenwood, Ill., "the engine and baggage-cars of the passenger-train went clear through the freight and were piled up in a heap of wreckage on the further side of the switch. The first coach of the picnic train plunged into the wreckage, and buried itself in a mass of kindling-wood under the demolished baggage-car. Nearly all of the passengers of the first coach were caught beneath the mass of debris."

In the wreck near Newmarket, Tenn., one of the worst on record, "the second coach ploughed its way into a bank in such a manner that the other cars were jammed into it and, pushed in by the weight of heavy Pullmans, were crushed like eggshells."

This monotonously doleful tale of death and disaster could be prolonged, but enough has been given to make reasonable the following conclusions: first, the position of the lighter cars and coaches between the heavy sleepers and the still heavier locomo-

tive subjects them to being telescoped in case of collisions; second, if no change in the construction is to be made, such cars and coaches should be placed in the rear of the train, as is already the practice on some limited trains on certain roads; third, baggage, mail, express, smoking, chair, and tourist cars, and all day coaches, as at present constructed, are too frail to resist the impact of collisions; fourth, the crushing of such cars increases the danger from fire, which adds the only element lacking to make the complete holocaust.

The weak construction of the average mail, baggage, express, and passenger coaches being the *locus injuriae* of most casualties in case of wrecks, the writer, at the close of the last session of Congress, introduced a bill to compel common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to strengthen the construction of their cars. By its terms, such cars were required to have strong, heavy underframes, with end and side sills of steel or other metal, and with not less than four girders or sleepers of steel running the entire length of the underframe, including the end platforms. The sills and sleepers were to be covered over with a steel floor of one-fourth-inch plates. The vestibule and framework of the superstructure were also to be made of steel or other metal. The purpose was to require the construction of a car whose floor and upper framework, including vestibules, would have the strength and rigidity of the modern sleeper, without its weight, and which, with girders of steel extending under strongly vestibuled end platforms, would prevent telescoping.

Steel passenger-cars are not unheard of. They have been largely used on the Continent of Europe, steel underframes being in common use. The Illinois Central Railroad Company, after three years of experimenting, has just built at its own shops eight steel passenger-coaches for its suburban service at Chicago. These coaches are giving excellent satisfaction, being of great strength and rigidity, with from six thousand to ten thousand pounds less of weight than cars of equal size of wood construction.* The Monon route has been running on its lines, for some time past, a steel postal-car. To prevent a repetition of the recent Paris Subway horror, the Interborough Rapid Transit Company, of New York, has ordered for its use 200 pressed-steel cars, all the furnishings of which are to be of metal.

* "Railway and Engineering Review," Sept. 5, 1903, page 601.

Steel cars, aside from their uninflammability, have points of advantage over the ordinary type of sleeper in that, with equal if not greater strength, they have less weight, and hence, in case of collision, less momentum; and yet, the degree of safety enjoyed by passengers in sleepers has been remarkable. During the three years prior to September, 1903, in which there were accommodated by the Pullman Company 32,693,341 railway passengers in all parts of the United States, 6 passengers were killed (these casualties occuring in two disastrous railway wrecks in different parts of the country), 4 were seriously and 64 slightly injured.

In reply to this statement, it may be argued that, as sleepers are ordinarily placed in the rear of trains, the force of collision expends itself before they are reached. While this is largely true in butting collisions, the argument avails nothing in rear-end collisions, where the sleeper is first to receive the brunt of impact. As there were, for the twelve months ending March 31st last, only 1,050 butting and 1,882 rear-end collisions, we might expect at least an equal if not greater number of casualties in the latter class of collisions; and yet 320 were killed and 2,792 injured in the butting collisions, while only 205 were killed and 2,063 injured in the rear-end collisions, The fact that the train collided with in rear-end collisions is either stationary or moving in the same direction with the colliding train lessens the force of impact and, therefore, the danger. This fact, added to the greater strength and resisting power of the sleepers in the rear of the train, accounts for the difference in the number of casualties between rear-end and head-on collisions. Moreover, accidents have been reported where the force of a rear-end collision has left the sleepers intact and their occupants uninjured, but transmitted itself through them to the day coaches with crushing and fatal effect.

Objection to steel cars may be made further on the ground that, with no light cars to act as cushions or buffers to deaden the impact, the shock, especially in a butting collision, in coming to a dead stop, would kill or maim more passengers than under present conditions. In the opinion of the "Scientific American," "this point is very much open to question. The passengers would be badly bruised and limbs would be broken, perhaps; but there would be none of the grinding, crushing and tearing of limb from limb that mark the telescoping of two cars."*

* "Scientific American," Feb. 6, 1904, page 117.

The last objection to steel cars on passenger-trains would arise on the ground of their cost. There are at present about thirty-nine thousand passenger-cars in service in the United States, valued at an average of five thousand dollars each, or a total of one hundred and ninety-five million dollars. Once equipped for such work, it is believed that the car-shops of this country could build steel cars for less than nine thousand dollars apiece, the cost of a wooden car. When life and limb are at stake, the question of cost should not receive too much consideration. In view of the fact that the net income of ninety-eight per cent. of the railroad mileage of the United States for the year ending June 30th, 1903, was $734,709,435, of which sum $91,162,712 was surplus and $159,310,010 was paid out in dividends,* an expenditure of two hundred or even three hundred millions of dollars for the construction of steel cars for passenger-trains, extended over a term of five or ten years, would not be unreasonable nor oppressive. The damages paid by railroads of this country for the last ten years, as a result of deaths and injuries received in wrecks, and for litigation arising therefrom, would go a great way toward equipping the roads of the country with such cars.

Steel freight-cars are already being used on many roads because of their greater strength, capacity and safety. Ought not like considerations to justify improvement in cars which carry human freight? It was a pressed-steel freight-car loaded with coal which rammed and crushed a passenger-car near Indianapolis about a year ago, killing 18 and injuring 25 Purdue College students. The freight-car was little injured, the coal not at all.

The railway postal-cars, being placed, as a rule, just behind the locomotive, occupy the position of the greatest danger. As there are over fifteen thousand United States Postal Clerks, these clerks annually furnish their quota, and it is a large one, to the list of railway casualties. The National Association of Postal Clerks has repeatedly appealed for cars having at least steel underframes. Under existing law, the Postmaster-General can prescribe the specifications for the framing of postal-cars; but the specifications which have recently been approved by the Post-Office Department differ but little from the specifications which have been followed for years past. Reform in car construction might well be inaugurated by the Government in requiring here-

* Interstate Commerce Com., 17 Annual Rept., page 108.

after, in the building of all its mail-cars, the use of steel underframes and steel studding, rafters and carlines in the superstructure. Especially ought this to be the case in view of the fact that the Government annually pays for the use of the car itself, its original cost of construction and, in many instances, more too.

In conclusion, while "the human factor in railroading constitutes the greatest peril," and without the most rigid and unrelaxing discipline the best appliances will not insure absolute safety, nevertheless I strongly urge that wise legislation will materially reduce the number of casualties now so discreditable to American railway management.

Such legislation should have for its object (1) the increase of the inspection force of the Government and the repair and instruction crews of the railroad companies, with increase of powers to Government inspectors; (2) the prevention of excessive hours of continuous labor on the part of railroad employees; (3) the prevention of the employment of youthful or incompetent or inexperienced men; (4) the compulsory installation of the most approved block-signal system; (5) the change of specifications by the Government for all mail-cars from wood to steel; (6) the compulsory use of passenger-cars with steel underframes and steel framework for superstructure and vestibules.

The wise manager anticipates the needs of the travelling public, and, in so doing, increases the patronage of his road. Legislation may not be needed for such as he, but it is needed to whip and spur to action those who lag behind.

JOHN J. ESCH.

THE IRISH MUSE.—I.

BY FIONA MACLEOD.

I.

We have in Ross and the Outer Isles a singular legend, which has a beauty within and without. A young crofter was unhappy in love, and not fortunate in the hard way of the hill-life. When bad seasons come on the back of the black wind, the croft-smoke turns from blue to brown, as the saying is: and it was brown smoke from end to end of the Strath, and every one of the scattered clansfolk there had suffered, but none so much as Fergus Dhu, who had lost sheep, and crops, and the youth out of his heart. One day he went idly across the boggy moor under Cnoc Glas, mooning among the black heather where the white tufts of canna were like blown foam of the sea. A single tree grew on that waste, a thorn that on a forgotten Beltane had been withered into a gray lifeless thing. It was called "The Thorn of the Gray Woman," "The Fairy Thorn," and "The Singing Tree" or "The Tree of Bad Music." At many a winter *ceilidh,* by the peat-glow, tales were passed of what had been seen or heard there: but they were all at one in this, that only the happy and fortunate were in peril there, and that only the unhappy and unfortunate might go that way, and, indifferent, see the tall swift woman in gray, or hear the thin music.

Likely, that was why Fergus—Fergus Dhu, as he was called, because of his black hair, and black eyes, and the dark hours into which he so often fell—wandered that day along the sodden bracken-covered sheep-ways. When he came to the Thorn he saw no gray woman, perhaps because there was no room in his mind for any but one woman, who now would never warm to him, but be a kindly stranger always; and heard no thin air, gay or wild, perhaps because the sad lift and fall in his heart was a day-long

sound that dulled his ears. But while he was staring idly into the withered thorn, he saw a short stem break into little green leaves. He could not believe what his eyes showed him; but, when he saw also pink and white blossoms run in and out among the leaves and break into a fall of snow, and felt the sudden sweetness in the air about him, he believed. He went closer, and his wonder grew when he saw that the stem had seven holes in it. He put his hand on the stem, and it came away. There was a hole at each end, and the thorn-reed was like any *feadan*. So he put it to his mouth, and ran his familiar fingers up and down the holes, for Fergus Dhu was the cunningest player in the Strath. He played till the whole Thorn went into a wave of green. He played till a snow of blossom came all over the boughs, like the whiteness of a running wave over the green of the sea. Although it was November, and wet, and the hill-wind had a moan in it as it searched the corries, it was like a May noon by the Thorn. Fergus looked at the sky, and saw that it was blue: at the long moor, and saw that it was covered with April yellow and with a shimmer of the wings of little birds. He looked at the gray hills to the east, and they were rose-red and a star was above them: he looked at the gray hills to the west, and they were blue as peat-smoke, and a rainbow leaned against them. Then his heart filled with gladness, and he played his joy. As he played, the rainbow leaned away from the gray hills of the west, and took their sadness, and was no more: the star sank behind the gray mountains of the east: the long moor faded into the old silence: the white foam and the green wave ebbed from the Thorn. Fergus looked at the thorn-pipe, and it was only a black, cloud-wet *feadan* with seven mossy holes in it.

He "went away" in that hour. No one saw him that night, or the next day, or the next; and months and years passed, and no one saw him, and his body was never seen, though his bonnet was found near the withered Thorn.

In the seventh year after that, a strange thing happened. A new life quickened the Thorn. A thousand small green buds shook out little fluttering green leaves, and, from these, white moths of blossom continually rose. Linnets sang on the branches.

One day Fergus Dhu came strolling that way. He had no memory of the years that had gone, or with whom he had been, and the sweet fatal accent was out of his ears. But when he saw

the Thorn he remembered his *feadan,* and took it from his coat-fold, and played because of his gladness. The tears fell from his eyes when he saw the gray rain come down and blot out the new life from the Thorn, so that it was old and withered again; and at the wet hill-wind calling again its old mournful cry, wheeling like a tired hawk above the far lamentation of the sheep. "Why is this?" he said. "When I saw this lonely place in its sorrow I played it into joy. And now, when I come upon it in its beauty, I have played it back into the old sorrow. Grief to my heart that it is so"!

One man of the Strath saw Fergus Dhu that day, but people did not know if Donald Mòr, the piper, was sure of his sight; for he had been given too much whiskey at "the big house," and, too, he spoke of Fergus as a thin worn leaf that one sees through when it hangs in the wind. Certainly, no other saw him, nor has seen him since.

This tale of Fergus, who was fey, and went down the west with strangers, came into my mind one day when I had been reading a little in and dreaming over a book wherein reverent and loving hands have gathered, from the hills and hollows and dim shores of Ireland, so much that is beautiful, so much too that, if not of beauty, is sweet and familiar, and overmuch, perhaps, that is of wild, rude, and bitter wayside-growth. For the Gaelic muse seems to me the beautiful and at once sad and joyous spirit of whom poor Fergus was but the troubled image. Does she, too, not go to and fro in a land where rainbows bloom and fade above desolate places; where a star hangs above the holy hills of the east; seeking her desire everywhere, nowhere finding her desire; going in sorrow, but, suddenly beholding the world radiant, breaking into songs of joy and laughter and sweet love; coming again, after an evil time, and finding the gray thorn of the world full of the green leaf, blossom and undying youth, and, so finding, turning suddenly to tears, and to the old sorrow, and to the longing whose thirst is not to be quenched; to the cry of the curlew for the waste, of the heart going a long way from shadow to shadow?

One must know the Gaelic muse in somewise thus, I think. How else can one understand the joy that is so near to sorrow, the sorrow that, like a wave of the sea, can break in a moment into dazzling light and beauty? I have heard often, in effect: "This is no deep heart that in one hour weeps, and in the next laughs."

But I know a deeper heart that in one hour weeps and in the next laughs, so deep that light dies away within it and silence fades into its own still oblivion: the heart of the sea. And there is another heart that is deep, and weeps in one hour and in the next laughs; the heart of the night: where dawns and sunsets are gathered dews, and where darkness that cannot be sounded is as a vast shore strewn with the shining pebbles of the stars. And there is another heart that is deep, and weeps in one hour and in the next laughs: the soul of man: where tears and laughter, sorrow and joy, fear and hope are the fans that blow the rose-white flame of life. And I am well content that the Gaelic heart, that in one hour weeps and in the next laughs, though it be so sad and worn among smiling nations, is in accord with the great spirits of the world, and with immortal things.

But now I must turn to the book over which I have been dreaming, and in which I have read often of late.

In our English speech there is no anthology that has the distinction of finality. Certainly, the best, "The Golden Treasury," does not satisfy all, and for many it lacks the ruder note that is natively dear to us, and the old note of wildness—which is not savagery, or strangeness for strangeness sake, but the remembered accent of the youth of the world—the old note of wildness that is again stealing back into the literatures of many lands, and perhaps into none more than into that of our own, and there, for the chief part as yet, through the listening ear and whispering lips of those who have something of the old Celtic magic in their blood.

It may be that the perfect English anthology, in the limited sense of a lovely final gathering from the poetry of England only, cannot be made till much that England treasures so greatly to-day shall be the dust of a to-morrow that must come. Or it may be that the collection already named, added to in this age or the next with a like care and love, may remain a true witness of a great race, whose finest poetry is, in the main, a passionate flame of the mind, or a still white flame of the known and tangible life, rather than a passionate flame of the soul and of the mysterious, troubled, and unknown and intangible life. It can never be the final anthology for the Scot, remembering his wild ballads and beautiful sad songs; nor for the Welsh people, with their insatiable longing for the hillside and the green wood, but a hill-

side that is not for climbing only or for shooting across, and a green wood that is not forbidden, and has secret places; nor for the Gael of the Highlands and Isles, who has an ancient music in his ears, and still listens to that, though it is upon the wind now; nor for the Irish, who have the "Rose of the World" for their heart's desire, and their own deeps of magical life, and the unperishing flame of a single great idea, that is at once a memory, a passion and a prayer.

Meanwhile, of the many anthologies, some excel in wise beauty: catholic, as "The Golden Treasury"; more austerely fine, as "The Flower of the Mind"; culled in the nearer fields, as well as on the high familiar slopes, as in "The Oxford Anthology." But all exceed; all temporize beyond the personal "yea" and "nay"; none excludes enough, sufficiently includes. Perhaps the only anthology that can come to us as a new and beautiful thing is an anthology gathered, solely at will, by a poet in love with what he has gone out to seek.

Nothing could appear to us more natural than a satisfying anthology of the poetry of Scotland, than a satisfying anthology of Irish poetry, or of Welsh poetry. There is none. There are treasurable volumes of the Scottish muse, but none that gives us uniquely the breath of Scotland, as the Greek anthology gives us uniquely the breath of Hellas. In art, there is a sunlit slope where life passes into song and fragrance, and where we desire no more, and, indeed, find therein an old and bitter wisdom made honey-sweet. Sometimes the still lips of history unconsciously whisper in the song, sometimes its long tale is concentrated into one breath of the fragrance. So, while we do not say that we find all Hellas in the Greek Anthology, or could find all Scotland in an ideal gathering of Scottish song, we might truly find in each the shaping inward spirit or sense that dwelled in the Hellenic genius or the Scottish genius, and intuitively may know much that is not said, and touch truth in silence, and nourish the mind through the delight of eye and ear. But on this sunlit slope we must not go seeking what is called "knowledge." There is enough of knowledge in the wind, on the hill, in the sea, in the song and its fulfilled music. To this sunlit slope we may go by that old Greek gate. I would we had a like gate for the muses of the West.

I know of no modern anthology which I have taken up with the same eager interest as, a year or two ago, I took up Mr. Yeats's

"Book of Irish Verse"; none ever gave me the like deep and wondering disappointment. It was as the communicable broken echo of an incommunicable passionate voice. The Ireland of one's dreams evaded one continually, and the fleeting glimpses, as in Mangan, made one but wonder the more.

Something akin to this I must say of the "Treasury of Irish Poetry," compiled with so much love and sympathy by two eminent Irish poet-critics, Mr. Stopford A. Brooke and Mr. T. W. Rolleston. It is by far the most satisfactory Irish anthology that has appeared, both as the most representative and as the most carefully and finely chosen. Mr. Stopford Brooke and Mr. Rolleston have enlisted, moreover, for lieutenants, nearly all the foremost Irish writers of to-day—which is sometimes an advantage, and sometimes is no advantage; for the habit of mere appreciation is common, and the gift of critical exposition too apt to be controlled or colored by predilection, while the dual gift of whole understanding and interpretation is rare. If all the critical portion of the book were written with the intellectual width of vision and balance of judgment of Mr. Stopford Brooke in his general Introduction, and of Mr. Rolleston in his appreciation of Mr. Yeats, with the distinction of Mr. Yeats's own brief notices, or with the poetic insight and interpretative charm of Mr. Lionel Johnson in his exposition of Clarence Mangan, this "Treasury" would take unique rank with all students of literature.

But, interesting, often delightful, sometimes fascinating as this book is, it leaves the reader, not with a satisfied sense of art, but with a dissatisfied sense of a high expectation of art unfulfilled. We have the songs and dreams of a nation, and that is good; but, since the days when Ireland renounced its ancient language for the language of an alien and dominant people, it has not achieved greatly, or even highly, in art; and only within a recent period, the period begun by Mangan and Ferguson, has it achieved in beauty what otherwise it has achieved in emotional intensity, in fine or commonplace conventions. To-day, if there is evident as yet no Irish poet of the epical reach and power of Ferguson, no lyrical poet of the ardor and sweep of Mangan, there are new singers who are Irish of the Irish in their passions and sympathies and emotions, but at heart are lovers of spiritual and temporal beauty before all else, and have more or less consciously set themselves to achieve in beauty what in beauty they have

dreamed—that is, are artists curiously persuading art. It is in this section of "The Treasury of Irish Poetry" one must look for the Ireland woven of dreams, shaped in longing, and divined in the expense of the spirit. It is not a large section, and it is not a great section; but one may see how it will become large enough to enshrine the dreams and hopes and perfected visions of a race in whom poetry is an instinct; and may become great, both in the high sense of the achievement that is above time and change, and in the deep sense of the achievement which companions the soul because it has striven to the beauty of spiritual life and has trusted in spiritual vision. If we seek rather for the beauty that can stand apart from time and country, than for that which must bear the impress of the time and the accent of the country, we shall not in this book find much that satisfies. Almost alone, I think alone, is a poem such as this, where Mr. Yeats is neither Irish nor English, but a poet whose utterance is in English:

"THE ROSE OF THE WORLD.

"Who dreamed that beauty passes like a dream?
For these red lips, with all their mournful pride,
Mournful that no new wonder may betide,
Troy passed away in one high funeral gleam,
And Usna's children died.

"We and the laboring world are passing by:
Amid men's souls, that waver and give place,
Like the pale waters in their wintry race,
Under the passing stars, foam of the sky,
Lives on this lonely face.

"Bow down, archangels, in your dim abode:
Before you were, or any hearts to beat,
Weary and kind one lingered by His seat;
He made the world to be a grassy road
Before her wandering feet."

If this, for many readers, be too remote in thought and expression, let them turn to the same poet's familiar, but ever new and lovely, lyric, "The Lake Isle of Innisfree," or to the simple but deep music of the poem written by one who has loved a beautiful woman, the poem called "When You Are Old":

"When you are old and gray and full of sleep,
And nodding by the fire, take down this book,
And slowly read, and dream of the soft look
Your eyes had once, and of their shadows deep;

"How many loved your moments of glad grace,
And loved your beauty with love false or true!
But one man loved the pilgrim soul in you,
And loved the sorrows of your changing face.

"And, bending down beside the glowing bars,
Murmur, a little sadly, how love fled
And paced upon the mountains overhead,
And hid his face amid a crown of stars."

It is urged, and not without show of justice in the plea, that so much of the poetry of Mr. Yeats, and of others to be named with him, is not Irish poetry, as we find it in the intense verse of Mangan, or in the light verse of Lever, Moore, and Father Prout, or in the heroic verse of Samuel Ferguson, or in the homely verse and winsome music of Allingham and Alfred Perceval Graves and Jane Barlow, or in the lyrical outcries of the poets of "The Nation," or in the ruder utterance of the unknown singers who bequeathed their crude but unforgettable national ballads in pieces such as "The Wearin' o' the Green," "The Cruiskeen Laun," and "The Shan Van Vocht." The poetry of Mr. Yeats, and others to be named with him, is certainly not distinctively Irish in this sense. But it must not be overlooked that the poetic spirit in every country has two instinctive movements: to become the color and sound of the national life in its outward and particular aspects, and to become the color and sound of the national genius in its inward life and universal appeal. The poet who ignores the accent of time and place is not necessarily the lesser patriot, the less truly nationalist, than the poet who, from the quality of his mind and spirit, or from choice, ignores the accent of the Land of Heart's Desire. Nor can we mistake the universality of the one for that colorless life which is not the universal, but the merely cosmopolitan, note: we cannot really mistake the hidden flower of its mortal life, with its root in time and place and country. If, to the ordinary sense there is no difficulty in recognizing the Irish popular accent in

"She's the most disthressful country that iver yet was seen,
For they're hangin' men and women there for wearin' o' the green,"

to the trained and poetic sense there is no difficulty in recognizing the Irish spiritual accent in a line such as (to quote from a poem by "A. E."—George Russell—Ireland's most spiritual singer),

"For, sure, the immortal waters run through every wind that blows"—

or Mr. Yeats's

"The immortal desire of immortals we saw in their faces, and sighed"—

or Nora Hopper's

"The world wears on to sundown, and love is lost or won"—

or her

"Rose o' the World, the pain you give
Is worth all days that a man may live"—

or Ferguson's

"For heavy on their senses the faint enchantment lies"—

or John Todhunter's

"O wind, O mighty, melancholy wind,
Blow through me, blow!
Thou blowest forgotten things into my mind,
From long ago."

in a sense, a country lives truly only when it realizes that its sole aim is not to live. Herein is one of the blind distances which separate the Gaelic world of Ireland and Scotland from the English world of Great Britain. The one strives to endure for the sake of being alive; the other endures in order truly to live: and the result is that the spiritual peril of the English nation is the loss of that which owns necessarily a temporal period having a like mortality with the body. Many a peasant on the hillside of Connaught or crofter in the rainy Hebrides—like that Aglaus, the poorest man in Arcady, whom the oracle pronounced happier and more fortunate than Gyges, King of Lydia—has a larger inheritance of life than the wealthy and proud in Dublin or Glasgow, Manchester or London. To live in beauty—which is to put into four words all the dream and spiritual effort of the soul of man—is the real, if unexpressed, aim of a nation become sensitive and spiritual, as to live in comfort and riches is the expressed and accepted aim of a nation become insensitive and material. It is this instinctive realization, far more than nurtured enmity or racial

distrust, which underlies the intense and justified nationalism of the finer Gaelic minds of to-day. It is here that there can be no compromise, here that there must be, if the need persist, a fight to the death. The moment that this spiritual nationalism is lost, Ireland is lost, Gaelic Scotland is a dream. The Gael can never become English without losing all that has made him Gaelic. He has so little else to lose, alas, that here he can compromise no more. His back is to the rock and to the sea.

In default of a Treasury of Irish Poetry in Gaelic, which to most of us would be an empty music, I wish we could have a Treasury of Gaelic Poetry in English translation. One man could do this excellently, Dr. Douglas Hyde, whose "Love Songs of Connaught" is a book so dear to every lover of the Celtic muse, and selections from which are among the most delightful contents in Mr. Stopford Brooke's and Mr. Rolleston's anthology. Well done, and in a rhythmic prose as nearly literal as practicable rather than in verse (or, if Dr. Hyde were the translator, both in a near prose and a metrical version), a volume such as suggested would indeed be a treasure-trove.

I confess that I made one mistake when I took up the "Treasury of Irish Poetry." That was to read much in it before I read the Introduction to the volume by Mr. Stopford Brooke. The reader should not do likewise. For Mr. Brooke exposes both what were the editorial aims and what are the admitted restrictions of this anthology, and, too accomplished a critic to allow national predilection to control judgment and taste, admits frankly, in effect, that here we have rather the material and promise of great art than great art itself. I think he sums up admirably what so many have variously said, and all concerned do in one way or the other strongly feel, on the question of the linguistic vehicle for Irish thought and Irish emotion and the Irish genius. "England naturally wished to get rid of the Irish tongue and was naturally careless of its literature; Ireland itself, and that was a pity, did not care enough about her own tongue to preserve it as a vehicle for literature; and, finally, her poets and thinkers were steadily driven to use the English language. Much has been lost by this distinction of a literary language, but much has also been gained. If Irish can again be used as a vehicle for literature, so much the better. A few are now making that endeavor, and all intelligent persons will wish them good luck and success. It is no disad-

vantage to a man or a country to be bilingual, and the teaching and use of the Irish tongue will throw light upon the ancient form of it, enable scholars to understand it better, and increase our knowledge of its treasures. Moreover, there are many realms of imaginative feeling in Ireland which cannot be justly put into poetic form except in the tongue of the country itself. No other vehicle can express them so well. On the other hand, the gain to Irishmen of speaking and writing in English is very great. It enables them to put their national aspirations, and the thoughts and passions which are best expressed in poetry, into a language which is fast becoming universal. It enables them to tell the world of literature of the ancient myths, legends, and stories of Ireland, and to represent them, in a modern dress, by means of a language which is read and understood by millions of folk in every part of the world. These considerations lie at the root of the matter, and if Irish writers do not deviate into an imitation of English literature, but cling close to the spirit of their native land, they will do well for their country when they use the English tongue."

That is wisely put, and great good would come both to the Irish writer and the English critic of Anglo-Gaelic literature if it were adequately understood by each. Each stands in a false position till he sees clearly that "Irish poetry, if it is to be a power in literature, must be as Irish as English poetry is English."

Nowhere in social energy is provincialism so wearisome as in the domain of the mind, and no literary species could be more swiftly fugitive than a Scoto-Gaelic or Irish-Gaelic literature whose central effort was "to be English." I have written elsewhere (and having thought much on the subject, and written carefully out of that thought, naturally been misunderstood and misrepresented by those who have not that habit of the mind which permits intellectual patience) that there can be no English literature but what conforms to the genius of the English language. Nothing can survive that is not of the central stream. The whole effort of art, as an intellectual energy, is to achieve the centre. If Irish or Scottish or Welsh or Canadian or American poets cannot accept the logic of an inevitable law, let them write in Gaelic or the Scots dialect, or in Irish or Welsh, or create a new Canadian or a new American speech. But if they would achieve in beauty in English, they must conform to the tradition of English, to the genius of the English language. When the

mysterious signal is come, all the salmon in the inland streams move towards the sea, to quench in its deep founts their ancestral thirst for the unknown. The wise seek the centre of their sweeping currents, and are borne from the river courses to the vast eternal flood. What of the unwise? Those who escape the common foe of man or bird or otter, their bodies are in the sedges, or they are trapped in a slow death in narrow backwaters, or are caught in pools sunken too far for the most desperate leap.

But to write for the centre—that is, to compel the wisely reluctant genius of a matured language to yield the secret of its power to charm, and to be content with nothing short of this compulsion or with no lesser company than the company of those who have striven and won—is not, in the instance of those we have in mind, the same thing as to *be* English, or to imitate what is English, or to cease to be Irish or Scottish or Welsh. No one can hold with more eager and deep conviction that the Irish writer must be Irish in heart and mind and spirit, and the Highland or Island Gael be Gaelic in heart and mind and spirit, and the Welsh writer be Welsh in heart and mind and spirit. But we have all to write in English, or choose to do so; and, the moment we have made that choice, we have to be on guard against the fatal intellectual provincialism which deprecates the essential and vital genius in the very goal which it is its effort to reach. "The very language is hateful to me," an Irishman whom I know is reported to have exclaimed: but he has no ambition greater than to achieve in that language, whose lesser use is also his bread, and the knowledge of which is his sole means of expression. It were better, I think, to learn some other tongue.

Emerson might have written his essays in Choctaw, or Poe his lyrics in Seminole, or Mr. Yeats his poetry in Sligo Gaelic: but they did not: and the sole concern we have with what they have offered us is as to the quality of the mental or spiritual emotion within the poem or essay, and as to the fashioning in English (their birth-raiment, their life-raiment, and, if so to be, their raiment for immortality) of the "embroidered cloths" in which they have come out to us from the House of the Spirit. If Emerson had not been Emerson, but another, or many masquerading under that name, or if Poe had not been Poe, but another, or many masquerading under that name, they would not be of the centre, but be provincial and forgotten. But the one was a great writer

and the other a great poet because they were national at the springs of genius; because each was individual in his own eccentric quest and achievement for the rainbow that somewhere awaits every word; and because each was universal in the final expression the one gave to his thought and the other to his emotion, and universal by a ceaseless expense in effort and a constant economy in result in order to achieve that tradition of the centre, English Literature—a tradition as real and imperative for them, writers in English though born of another nation, as for Goldsmith or Swift or Walter Scott. No Irishman could be more truly a nationalist, in the best sense, than Walter Scott was a Scot: but the genius of this provincial squire led him straight to the core of the one speech common to us all, and to the recognition that mastery of it could be attained only by acceptance of the inevitable laws of its central tradition. To this day he is so essentially Scottish that he stands for Scotland, but in his genius he comprises many lands, and utters the supreme and universal tongue which is of no land. In some sort, this must be the ideal of every artist using words as his means of expression, the still words quickened into the shape and color which make living English.

That is why Mr. Stopford Brooke, and every one with the real interest of Anglo-Gaelic literature at heart, lays so imperative insistence on the element of nationality. Those English critics who would see Ireland, Scotland and Wales denationalized, in the domain of letters as in the domain of politics, are foolish as well as unjust, for they do but sap the strong sea-walls built to keep back the floods. English Letters has to-day, with its ever-rising waste of worthless fiction and incompetent comment, enough to do without urging the Celtic contingents to work in the same grooves, and with the same outworn conventions! As for those of us, whether north of the Highland line or west of the Manx Sea, who do not recognize this, or fail in eager and proud observance of this most precious heritage, no more need be said than this, that in ceasing to be national such become provincial only. It is in this sense that London is so overwhelmingly provincial, because it is the centre towards which the provincial mind gravitates and where it finds its most congenial conditions.

FIONA MACLEOD.

(To be Continued.)

SUICIDE AND LIFE INSURANCE.

BY W. H. LAWTON.

ONE can hardly pick up a newspaper without seeing an item reading somewhat as follows:

"Before Judge Blank and a jury yesterday, John Doe was tried and convicted of arson. According to the evidence, Doe, after taking out $2,000 insurance on a lot of antiquated and unsalable goods, sprinkled the latter with kerosene and set fire to his store. Unfortunately for Doe's plans, the fire was put out before the place was much damaged. The insurance companies did the rest, and Doe will spend a few years working for the State."

Not very long ago, the reader might have seen in the papers a sensational account of the suicide of a millionaire. When his affairs were investigated, it turned out that he was heavily involved, but his creditors would lose nothing because he was insured for over a million dollars.

On reading the first of these items, the average reader would say, "Serve John Doe right"! but, as to the second, he would reflect with calm satisfaction or indifference on the wonderful system of finance by which a man may enjoy life spending other people's money, and at the last leave this world of his own volition contented with the thought that his creditors and family would be amply cared for by the life-insurance companies.

A man who deliberately burns down his own house to secure the insurance is denounced as a swindler, and punished. Public opinion sustains the fire-insurance companies in refusing to pay the loss. The man who obtains a heavy life insurance, and then takes his own life so that his family or estate may benefit by the insurance—what is he? If we are to believe the comments of the general public, as represented in nine-tenths of the newspapers and periodicals, he is more or less of a hero. At most, the rash act

is attributed to "temporary insanity," and it is a bold company that will risk its popularity by protesting against paying for a risk it did not really assume. The amount involved in the quoted instance has made that case unusually prominent, but it is by no means the only claim of the kind that insurance companies have been called upon to pay during the last few years.

It may be pertinently asked how much the life-insurance companies themselves have had to do with bringing about this situation, by more or less reckless attempts to outbid each other in offering more liberal features in their policies. The time was when no insurance company willingly paid a suicide claim. Self-destruction was looked upon by the company in the same light as destruction of one's own property to recover the insurance. It was regarded as an attempt to swindle the company. But, in the course of time, the courts began to make a distinction between suicides committed with intent to defraud the company, and suicides which resulted from insanity. It became a cynical by-word in insurance offices that every suicide was insane—if he was insured. In fact, one learned judge declared that suicide was *prima facie* evidence of insanity. Hence, it logically followed that an insured suicide was the victim of disease or accident, and the company, of course, was liable. When this principle seemed to be firmly established, the companies sought to protect themselves by clauses in their policies denying liability in case of suicide, "sane or insane"; but, in response to the public sense of fair-play, they generally agreed to refund the "reserve," that part of the premiums paid which had been held for future cost or redemption of the policy. At this point, the vexed question seemed to be fairly settled.

In those days, however, the stress of severe competition was beginning to affect the life-insurance business. One company boldly took the lead in liberalizing the terms of its policies, and agreed to pay suicide claims in full after the third year. In explanation, it was argued that the company's statistics showed the deaths by suicide to be less than one-half of one per cent. of the total deaths from all causes, a proportion so small as to be practically *nil*. The company decided to assume the risk, but with the precaution of a three years' restriction to prevent clearly fraudulent suicides. It was not deemed reasonable to suppose that any man would carry insurance for three years with the intention of committing suicide

in the fourth. This "incontestable" policy proved very popular with the insuring public, not so much because it gave the insured permission to commit suicide after three years, but because it gave him the assurance that after three years the company would not contest payment of a claim under it for any cause whatever, as long as the premiums were duly paid. Other companies followed suit. One restriction after another was removed, and this course was heralded with loud claims of "the most liberal policy." The time-limit was shortened from three to two years, then to one year, and, finally, a few companies issued policies "incontestable from date of issue." To-day, out of sixty-nine old-line companies of the United States and Canada, there is but one which refuses to accept liability for suicide, though it agrees to refund the "reserve." Five retain the suicide restriction for three years, twenty-nine for two, twenty-six for one, while eight give the insured full permission to blow out his brains or otherwise make away with himself as soon as he has paid the first premium, secure in the knowledge that his family or estate will receive the full amount of the policy from the company!

It cannot be denied, therefore, that the life-insurance companies have by their own act deliberately offered inducement and temptation to suicide. It is quite possible to conceive of a man harassed by debt, facing inevitable bankruptcy, perhaps disgrace, being led to the last desperate act by the knowledge that his insurance policies contain no restrictions on suicide. To a man in this despairing frame of mind, suicide means comfort and even luxury to his family, and the salvation of his financial "honor"! When a man is at such a crisis in his life, it takes very little to move him to commit the crime. Crime? He hardly considers it such. Conventionally, society frowns upon it. Secretly, it frequently approves the act and pities, if it does not applaud, the doer. He does not regard it as a fraud upon the company, for has not the company itself tacitly agreed to consider suicide merely a regular cause of death? Did not the agent glowingly dwell upon the clause "no restrictions after such and such a time"? A suggestion to that man that forgery, or personal use of trust funds, at that critical moment would save him might be repelled with honest indignation. Yet suicide, for the purpose of obtaining the insurance on his life for his family or creditors, is as much a fraud on the company as would be the forgery of its name to a draft.

No doubt, a great part of the public apathy and indifference to this crime of defrauding insurance companies is due to the prevailing tendency to condone almost any attempt to "beat" a corporation. There is very widespread misconception of what constitutes a life-insurance "company." Few men realize that taking a policy in any company makes the insured a member of that company. No matter whether it was originally organized as a stock company or a mutual concern, a life-insurance company is, to all intents and purposes, a great co-operative society. All its members share, in some form or other, in its profits, and all are equally affected by its losses. But the very size of most of the companies, with their members scattered all over the world, tends to obscure this fact. If we could take one hundred men living in the same town, insure them for $10,000 each, on the same basis as any of the old-line companies, the suicide of one of those men would bring home to the remaining ninety-nine a realizing sense of the fraud perpetrated upon them, as nothing else could. Yet those same men will regard with complacent indifference a suicide loss of a million dollars in a far-off town, because the loss is divided among several hundred thousand members of different companies. In fact, the refusal of any company to pay such a fraudulent claim would be commented upon with indignation. How many of those men would contribute from their own pockets to pay a *pro rata* share of the debts of that suicide? Yet that is exactly what they have done in paying the premiums on their own insurance, and what they will continue to do as long as the companies pay such claims.

What has been the effect upon the companies of these reckless temptations to suicide? Judging from the frequent letters and editorials in life-insurance journals of late, it is quite evident that there has been such an increase in suicide losses as to seriously alarm them. More attention is being paid by medical departments to the "moral hazard." More careful scrutiny into the business affairs of applicants for large amounts is insisted upon. And no wonder! From the almost inappreciable ratio of less than one-half of one per cent., the ratio of suicide losses has increased to three per cent. in one of the largest companies of the United States, an increase of over six hundred per cent. in less than twenty years. On the other hand, some years ago the officers of a great fraternal insurance association, becoming alarmed by the in-

creasing number of suicide claims, secured the adoption of a by-law refusing payment in such cases, with the result of an immediate and heavy reduction of deaths from suicide.

Manifestly, the time is drawing near when the insurance companies will be forced, in justice to the great majority of their policy-holders, to restore, to a great extent, the restrictions on suicide in their policies. It is high time that this should be done, when, to the familiar joke of "selling out to the fire-insurance company," is added the happy phrase "committing suicide for the benefit of creditors and family."[1] But even then there will be left on the companies' books millions of insurance subject to this latter-day method of fraud. After the companies have done all they can to prevent the alarming increase of suicides, there is still much room for arousing the public conscience to a sense of the wrong to the great body of policy-holders, as well the danger to the body politic, and to encourage social condemnation of it. It was one of the worst symptoms of social degeneracy in ancient Rome that suicide became almost what we would call to-day a fad. Is there danger to the American Republic from that source to-day?

In twelve years there have been over 77,000 suicides recorded in the United States, the number increasing annually from about 3,500 in 1891 to 8,600 in 1903.[2] There were fifty per cent. more suicides in Chicago in 1903 than in 1902. In Philadelphia, for 1902, the official records showed a ratio of 15 suicides per 100,000 of population.[3] But the president of a life-insurance company has stated that, while during fifty years the increase in suicides has averaged 30 to each 1,000,000 persons, the increase of suicides among insured lives has been much greater. He adds that there is little doubt that, when persons are insured under a policy containing a suicide clause, suicidal deaths are often reported as accidental.[4] So, while the restoration of the suicide clause will undoubtedly greatly reduce the proportion of insured suicides, it will not eliminate them entirely. Nevertheless, it is quite apparent

[1] Henry H. Putnam, in "Journal of Insurance Ecomonics" for July, 1904.

[2] Mr. Upton, editor of the "Chicago Tribune," in the "Independent."

[3] "Medical News," of New York, Mch. 7th, 1903, and Sept. 5, 1903, quoted in paper by Dr. John L. Davis, Med. Director of the Union Central Life Ins. Co.

[4] President Fouse of the Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co.

that the temptation to suicide is stronger where the inducement of benefiting the family is held out.

It is an easy matter for the companies to put a stop to this insidious form of temptation to suicide, and protect the funds they have collected from honest policy-holders. According to the signs of the times, it will not be a very great while before most of them will do so, by restoring in some form the restrictions of the old suicide clause. There is hesitation in taking the lead, which is due to the fear of losing business in the severe competition that prevails to-day. But there are not wanting also signs that, if the companies do not act, the courts will. It is a far cry from the old days when a court practically threw open the doors to suicide claims by proclaiming that suicide is insanity *per se,* to the doctrine that it is against public policy and welfare to permit any company, no matter what its contract may say, to pay claims that necessarily encourage suicide. Nevertheless, that is the gist of a late court decision, which will undoubtedly be followed by others as cases become more and more flagrant. But it is not wise for the companies to wait for this. Life insurance is primarily based on confidence, and men distrust "law-made" honesty. A company that issues an unrestricted contract, and then shields itself behind the courts, will suffer in the estimation of its policy-holders and the public. But, in the meantime, in all fairness to the companies, an enlightened public opinion should condemn, not condone, the acts of those who would take advantage of the companies' mistaken liberality.

W. H. Lawton.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT.

BY GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL.

THE Vernons are an ancient and noble race, who came into England with the Conqueror. One of them married an heiress called Venables; his son became Venables-Vernon, and was made Lord Vernon in 1762. This Lord Vernon married Martha Harcourt, granddaughter of Lord Chancellor Harcourt, and heiress of the last Earl Harcourt. The second son of this marriage was the Rev. Edward Venables-Vernon, who was born in 1757, assumed the additional name of Harcourt on succeeding to the estates of his mother's family, was made Bishop of Carlisle in 1791, and Archbishop of York in 1808. This admirable divine had private property to the extent of £10,000 a year: and drew some £40,000 a year from the Church for the space of forty years. He died at the age of ninety; and his character was drawn by the hand of a master in a sketch which is worth reproducing for reasons which will afterwards appear.

"There was a charming kindness and love about him, and simplicity and absence of selfishness. The want was depth—in every way; in intellect, in moral purpose, in sense of responsibility, in concentration of affection. His face quite expressed it; broad, large, yet fine features, nothing gross or low or Rubens-like, but broad and unconcentrated; a man of unbroken prosperity, whom nothing deeply wounded, from whom no crushing would bring out perfume; yet lovable, very, from extreme kindness, simplicity, unaffectedness; chatty, discursive; easily, never deeply, interested; a man to live with, not to die with; for sunshine, not for clouds and storm and dark, dark night; yet quite very lovable."

It was one of the elements of this "unbroken prosperity" that Archbishop Harcourt married Lady Anne Leveson-Gower, daughter of the first Marquess of Stafford—a potentate of the highest renown among the Whigs. And who were the Whigs? and what

was Whiggery? In answering these questions, let me venture to borrow from myself.

Whiggery, rightly understood, was not a political creed but a social caste. The Whig, like the poet, was born, not made. It was as difficult to become a Whig as to become a Jew. Macaulay was probably the only man who, being born outside the privileged enclosure, ever penetrated to its heart and assimilated its spirit. The Whigs, indeed, as a body, held certain opinions and pursued certain tactics which have been analyzed in chapters XIX. and XXI. of the unexpurgated "Book of Snobs." But those opinions and those tactics were mere accidents, though perhaps inseparable accidents, of Whiggery. Its substance was relationship.

When Lord John Russell formed his first administration, his opponents alleged that it was mainly composed of his cousins, and one of his younger brothers was charged with the impossible task of rebutting the accusation in a public speech. Mr. Beresford-Hope, in one of his novels, made excellent fun of what he called "the sacred circle of the great-grandmotherhood." He showed—what, indeed, the Whigs themselves knew uncommonly well—that from a certain Earl Gower, who flourished in the last century, and was great-great-great-grandfather of the present Duke of Sutherland, are descended all the Levesons, Gowers, Howards, Cavendishes, Grosvenors, Russells and Harcourts, who walk on the face of the earth. Truly a noble and highly favored progeny. "They *are* our superiors," said Thackeray; "and that's the fact. I am not a Whig myself (perhaps it is as unnecessary to say so as to say I'm not King Pippin in a golden coach, or King Hudson, or Miss Burdett-Coutts). I'm not a Whig; but oh, how I should like to be one!"

By this illustrious alliance the Archbishop became the father of fourteen Vernon-Harcourts. A lady who married one of them used to say that a Wild Boar, which is the crest of the Vernons, and a Peacock, which is the crest of the Harcourts, were the two most appropriate emblems of her husband's family which could be found in the whole heraldic menagerie. And, indeed, if the Boar symbolizes a rugged disregard of other's feelings, and the Peacock an ostentatious satisfaction with one's own performances, the appropriateness of the badges has not been decreased by lapse of time.

Archbishop Harcourt, like the good Christian that he was,

realized that charity begins at home, and was careful to avoid the censure which the Apostle passes on him who fails to provide for those of his own house. He flourished in the great days of the Anglican Establishment; before the Ecclesiastical Commission had laid its levelling hand on Episcopal incomes, and when an Archbishop's patronage, ecclesiastical and secular, was practically unbounded. Accordingly, all the Vernon-Harcourts were enriched; and among them was the Rev. William Vernon-Harcourt, Canon of York and Rector of the lucrative living of Bolton Percy; who became in 1827, father of William George Granville Venables-Vernon-Harcourt.

The subject of our present study was, therefore, what the Scotch call "a son of the manse." He believed that the happiest days of his life were those which he had passed in the holy privacy of a country parsonage. When Arthur Pendennis gushed over the "long, calm evenings" in the country, George Warrington brutally rejoined: "Devilish long, and a great deal too calm. I've tried 'em!" And Sir William Harcourt "tried 'em" for some eighteen years; for this gentle child of a pastoral home was never subjected to the brutalizing influences of a public school.

It argues no blind faith in a strange system of unnatural restraints and scarcely more reasonable indulgences, to hold that the training of a public school is the best adapted to the common run of Englishmen. "It made us what we were, sir," said Major Bagstock to Mr. Dombey; "we were iron, sir, and it forged us." The average English boy being what he is by nature—"a soaring human boy," as Mr. Chadband called him—a public school simply makes him more so. It confirms alike his characteristic faults and his peculiar virtues, and turns him out, after five or six years, that altogether lovely and gracious product—the Average Englishman. This may be readily conceded; but, after all, the pleasantness of the world as a place of residence, and the growing good of the human race, do not depend exclusively on the Average Englishman; and something may be said for the system of training which has produced, not only all famous foreigners (for they, of course, are a negligible quantity), but such exceptional Englishmen as William Pitt and Thomas Macaulay, and John Keble and Samuel Wilberforce and William Harcourt.

All these famous men went from home to the University; and

in his nineteenth year Mr. W. V. Harcourt became a member of Trinity College, Cambridge. There were giants in those days; and it should always be remembered, to the credit of his powers and his industry, that in 1851 he was placed eighth in the First Class of the Classical Tripos; J. B. Lightfoot, afterwards Bishop of Durham, being Senior Classic.

Immediately after taking his degree, Mr. Vernon-Harcourt came up to London, and entered on a double career of journalism and law.

In 1852 he published anonymously two letters on "The Morality of Public Men," which criticised, in imitation of "Junius," the attempt of the Conservative Government to revive protection. These letters did just what they were intended to do. They did not frighten Lord Derby, nor bring a blush to Mr. Disraeli's hardened cheek. They did not materially contribute to the victory of free trade; but they served an even more important end—they got their author talked about. And what can an ambitious youth desire more? The Whigs made much of their young recruit. He became the oracle of Strawberry Hill, and the spoilt child of Devonshire House. His social talents were soon recognized, and he grew to be a diner-out of established vogue. Meanwhile he was acquiring a good practice at the Parliamentary Bar, where in those days connection and address were more esteemed than legal learning; and his leisure moments were occupied in that rather savage sort of anonymous criticism which was then the stock-in-trade of the "Saturday Review."

In 1859 he made his first attempt to enter Parliament, standing in the Liberal interest for the borough of Kirkcaldy. "We are all the victims of circumstances, and I the greatest," exclaimed Mr. Pickwick in his agony, when Mrs. Bardell accused him of breach of promise of marriage. And Mr. Vernon-Harcourt might well have said the same, for his defeat was, in great part, due to the fury of a novelist who lived in the neighborhood, and who believed, quite erroneously, that the Liberal candidate was the Saturday Reviewer who had scarified his latest novel.

Balked in his Parliamentary ambitions, Mr. Vernon-Harcourt applied himself with redoubled vigor to the bar. He took International Law under his special protection; and, during the American Civil War, he poured himself forth in the "Times" over the signature "Historicus," with such good effect that, a few

years later, he was made Professor of International Law by his own University of Cambridge.

At the General Election of 1868, his great chance arrived. He was returned to Parliament for the City of Oxford; and immediately became an active, able, and rather factious member of the advanced section of the Liberal party. For his official leaders he showed scant respect, and even Mr. Gladstone's towering personality failed to strike him with awe. Just before the downfall of Mr. Gladstone's first administration, he took office as Solicitor-General, and, when it was represented to him that loyalty to leaders was expected in those who have "taken the shilling," he replied that he had only "taken the sixpenny bit." From this it will be rightly inferred that Sir William Harcourt (as he now was) thought highly of himself and his deservings; and an opportunity soon arrived for forcing himself into greater prominence, and at the same time chastising the leader who had offered the sixpenny bit where the shilling was due.

At the beginning of 1874, a General Election took place. The Liberals were beaten, Mr. Disraeli (soon to become Lord Beaconsfield) became Prime Minister with a great majority, and Mr. Gladstone announced his impending retirement from the Liberal Leadership. Sir William Harcourt was not the man to waste his time in unavailing homage to defeated heroes. He was by profound conviction a worshipper of the rising sun and Mr. Disraeli became the subject of his almost oppressive adoration. Archbishop Tait brought in a "Public Worship Regulation Bill," the object of which, abruptly stated by Mr. Disraeli, was "to put down Ritualism." Seeing that it promised to be popular, the Government adopted the bill, and afforded facilities for its consideration. Mr. Gladstone, who had retired to the undisturbed enjoyment of hymnology and Homer, scented the battle from afar, rushed up to London from Hawarden, and offered the bill a strenuous and almost single-handed opposition. The most entertaining passages of arms took place between him and Sir William Harcourt, who had so lately been his Solicitor-General. Sir William had espoused the bill with extraordinary ardor, and, when the House of Lords dealt rather cavalierly with some amendments of the Commons, he implored Mr. Disraeli to take up the cudgels, and expressed his confidence in him in dithyrambic terms:

"We have a leader of this House who is proud of the House of Commons, and of whom the House of Commons is proud. Well may the Prime Minister be proud of the House of Commons, for it was the scene of his early triumphs, and it is still the arena of his later and well-earned glory. . . . We may well leave the vindication of the reputation of this famous assembly to one who will well know how to defend its credit and its dignity against the ill-advised railing of a rash and rancorous tongue."

A provision had been introduced into the bill which would have overthrown the Bishop's right of veto on proceedings against Ritualists, and would have invested the Archbishop with power to institute suits, or allow them to be instituted, in a diocese not his own. This provision Mr. Gladstone vehemently opposed, on the ground that it was contrary to the whole tradition and structure of the Church, and that it was fundamentally inconsistent with the custom of Christendom as regards the relations between Metropolitans and their suffragans. In support of this view he quoted at large from the canonist Van Espen. Sir William Harcourt poured scorn on these citations; was proud to say he had never heard of Van Espen; pooh-poohed all canonists and casuists; adopted Mr. Bright's famous phrase about ecclesiastical rubbish; took the broad and manly ground of common sense, common law, and the Constitution and accused Mr. Gladstone of having come back to wreck the bill at the eleventh hour. Five days afterwards Sir William resumed his discourse. He had got up the case in the mean time, and met Mr. Gladstone on his own ground. He argued the question of canon law. He cited Ayliffe's "*Parergon Juris Canonici Anglicani*," and Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law," and sought to show that the power claimed for the Metropolitan was as sound canonically as constitutionally. This unexpected display of erudition gave Mr. Gladstone an opportunity, which he was not slow to use.

He rebuked "the honorable and learned gentleman" for having given one of the most conspicuous and most objectionable examples he had ever known of the vicious practice of discussing speeches delivered in the Lords. And then, referring to Sir William's canonical exercitations, he said:

"I confess, fairly, I greatly admire the manner in which he has used his time since Friday night. On Friday night, as he says, he was taken by surprise. The lawyer was taken by surprise, and so was the Professor

of Law in the University of Cambridge; the lawyer was taken by surprise, and, in consequence, he had nothing to deliver to the House except a series of propositions on which I will not comment. I greatly respect the order, and the spirit of the order, of the House, which renders it irregular, as, in my opinion, it is highly inconvenient, especially when there is no practical issue, to revive the details and particulars of a former debate. Finding that he has delivered to the House most extraordinary propositions of law and history that will not bear a moment's examination, my honorable and learned friend has had the opportunity of spending four or five days in better informing himself upon the subject, and he is in a position to come down to this House, and for an hour and a half to display and develop the erudition he has thus rapidly and cleverly acquired. Human nature could not possibly resist such a temptation, and my honorable and learned friend has succumbed to it. . . .

"There is one thing against which this House cannot too much protest —that whenever a man is opposed to you, you should fix upon him a bad name. That is my honorable and learned friend's frequent course. . . . My honorable and learned friend is still in his parliamentary youth: he has not as yet sowed his political wild oats. When he has done so, I have not the smallest doubt that all these great powers which he has developed, and which no one can see in development and exhibition with greater satisfaction than myself, will be found combined with a degree of temper, and wisdom, and consideration for the feelings of others, and with a degree of care in stating the arguments of opponents, that will make him outshine and eclipse them in his eloquence and, if he have opportunity, in his knowledge of Metropolitan Visitation. . . . The main reason why I never will, without necessity, follow my honorable and learned friend into these roads of controversy is this, that I am quite convinced—and let my words be marked—that it is well for this House to consider whether it does or does not desire to maintain a national Establishment of religion in this country. If it is desired to maintain that national Establishment of religion, then I say that moderation in act and temper and mildness of language are absolutely necessary in those who undertake to guide the House on these difficult and perilous questions. But if the tone and the language and the temper of my honorable and learned friend are to be taken as the standard which is in future to govern us in ecclesiastical discussions, I say that, whoever is wrong or whoever is right, there is one result that will override us and pass by us; and that is that the national Establishment of religion will give way under the strokes that will be dealt to it by its most ill-advised defenders."

Thus ended this rather unequal duel and from that time forward Sir William Harcourt never attempted to cross swords with his former chief. On the subject of Ritualism he kept silence, yea even from good words, though it was pain and grief

unto him, until Mr. Gladstone was safely laid in Westminster Abbey.

At the period which we have now reached, close observers of Sir William detected in him some signs of an intention to quit the Liberal party, which was disorganized and feeble, and to attach himself to the conquering standard of Lord Beaconsfield. But the Tory chief had read the "Legend of Montrose," and apparently regarded these overtures much as Lord Menteith regarded those of Major Dugald Dalgetty: "I had scarce patience with the hired gladiator, and yet could hardly help laughing at the extremity of his impudence."

The services which one general rejected, another was glad enough to accept; and this stout soldier of fortune became the sworn adherent of Lord Hartington, now Duke of Devonshire, and then leader of the Liberal party. But soon a new danger threatened. The "Bulgarian Atrocities" of the Turkish Government in 1876 again drew Mr. Gladstone from his retirement. He flung himself into the agitation against Turkey with a zeal which in his prime he had never excelled, if indeed he had ever equalled it. He displayed a versatility, a courage, and a resourcefulness which raised the enthusiasm of his followers to the highest pitch, and filled his guilty and baffled antagonists with a rage akin to frenzy. Lord Hartington, whose mind moved more slowly and uttered itself more cautiously, soon found himself pushed aside from his position of titular command. Though there was a section of the Whigs who doggedly supported Turkey, it soon became evident that, both in the House and in the country, the fervor, the faith, the militant and victorious element in the Liberal party were sworn to Mr. Gladstone's standard. It was just two years since he had resigned the leadership of the party, and he was again its dominating and inspiring influence.

Now this turn of events was by no means agreeable to Sir William Harcourt. The sentiments which he then entertained towards his former chief had been put beyond the pale of doubt by the indiscreet publication of some private correspondence. It was, indeed, highly desirable that Lord Beaconsfield should be dethroned, but supremely undesirable that Mr. Gladstone should reign in his stead. Many and various were the devices designed to avert that catastrophe. Nothing was said: prudence and the memory of the debate on the Public Worship Regulation Bill

forbade it. But much was whispered. Mr. Gladstone was wild, incalculable, irresponsible. He was a fanatic. He was a ritualist. His campaign in Midlothian had cost the party fifty seats. He had retired finally from official life. He had offended the Queen. His health would never stand the burden of a second Premiership; if he took office at all it must be in some subordinate capacity under Lord Hartington. This sweet intrigue, industriously promoted by anonymous writers in the press, went merrily on till Easter, 1880, when Parliament was dissolved, and at the General Election Lord Beaconsfield was beaten by 100. Under these circumstances, no course was constitutionally open to the Queen except to send for Lord Hartington, who was still the titular leader of the Liberal party. If I am correctly informed, Sir William Harcourt was the most strenuous of all the counsellors who urged Lord Hartington to accept the Premiership. But Lord Hartington knew better. Having ascertained that Mr. Gladstone would not serve under him, and naturally shrinking from the prospect of having his former chief as a candid friend and independent critic of his administration, he declined the Queen's commission, and Mr. Gladstone became Prime Minister for the second time. He made Sir William Harcourt his Home Secretary; and it is but bare justice to say that Sir William, having accepted this new service, threw himself into it with his accustomed vigor.

Having rather late in life come out as a Gladstonian Liberal, he blacked himself all over for the part. For the next five years, Sir William was a prominent and valuable member of Mr. Gladstone's administration. His most notable achievement was the Irish Crimes Act of 1882, which, courageously administered by Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan, brought the murderers of Lord Frederick Cavendish to the gallows, and stamped out political crime in Ireland. In the summer of 1885 the Liberals were turned out of office; and the General Election of the ensuing autumn left them still in opposition. The Tories had obtained and kept office by a close alliance with the Parnellite members, and Sir William Harcourt indulged in characteristic pleasantries about his opponents "stewing in Parnellite juice," when, lo! on the 17th of December, 1885, it was announced that Mr. Gladstone had become a Home-Ruler. The Parnellites joined their forces to his and gave him a majority in the House

of Commons. On the 1st of February, 1886, he became Prime Minister for the third time, Sir William Harcourt consenting to be stewed in Parnellite juice and serving under him as Chancellor of the Exchequer. For the next six years, the versatile actor was destined to play another new and very unfamiliar part, and to stand before the astonished world as the Protagonist of Home Rule. In August, 1892, these uncongenial toils were duly rewarded. The General Election had again replaced Mr. Gladstone in power, and with him Sir William Harcourt, who was again Chancellor of the Exchequer. The interior life of Mr. Gladstone's last Cabinet was not that of a happy family. The Wild Boar ravaged the vineyard, and the Peacock uttered discordant cries. As Christian, Countess of Devonshire, wrote to her nephew in 1653: "Where you are of the Choir, there can be no harmony in the Musick." It was known that Mr. Gladstone had taken office only in order to pass the Home Rule Bill through the Commons; and, that task accomplished, he was ready and eager to depart. Who was to succeed him? The Queen's choice seemed practically restricted to two men. In the House of Lords, the leader was a man young as politicians go; clever, judicious, adroit; who had never neglected an opportunity of gaining a friend, and would compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and add even the humblest unit to his personal following. In the House of Commons the leader was a man twenty years older; quite as clever; infinitely better informed; a parliamentarian of unequalled resources; who had never opened his mouth without making an enemy; had trampled on every one who came near him; and under whom no self-respecting colleague could consent to serve. So Lord Rosebery became Prime Minister; and Sir William Harcourt, in spite of high abilities, great achievements, and substantial virtues, missed the supreme prize of public life, because he had never learnt to keep a civil tongue in his head.

Though disappointed of the Premiership, Sir William still contrived to bulk largely in the public eye. As leader of the House of Commons, he controlled the legislative business of Parliament, and he was determined that the session of 1894 should be wholly his. He devoted it to a really great and striking Budget, which did much towards redressing the inequalities of taxation, and placed a proper share of the burden of Empire on

the landowners and the brewers. In piloting this measure through the House of Commons, Sir William, who had always been known as a very clever man, displayed new and unsuspected gifts. He obtained complete mastery over the complicated details of our fiscal system; and, whereas his public speaking had up to that time been the mechanical delivery of carefully written orations, he now developed the much higher power of quick, easy, and dexterous debating.

In the other performance to which, during the Parliament of 1892-5, Sir William Harcourt addressed himself, he was less successful. In his younger days of political independence, he had been a stout opponent of interference with the Liquor Traffic. Indeed, some elephantine jest of his about "grandmotherly legislation" had been adopted by the champions of Unrestricted Beer as their motto and watchword. But here again, as lightly as Dugald Dalgetty passed from the service of the King of Spain to that of the States of Holland, Sir William transferred his sword to the Army of Local Veto; and his blind zeal for the new flag caused his own rejection and the ruin of his party, at the General Election of 1895. After that monumental defeat, he tried for a while to lead the disheartened and disorganized forces of the Opposition; but his heart soon failed him and he disappeared into private life.

Disappeared—but only for a season; for, lo! yet another flag and another cause soon claimed his sword; or, rather, having exhausted all the possibilities of fresh service, he reverted to the standard of 1874, and burst upon the world again as the Champion of No-Popery.

Theological controversy had a peculiar fascination for Sir William Harcourt. It afforded him unequalled opportunities for indulging his special gifts. It enabled him to wound other people in their most sensitive points; and to do so with perfect impunity, as those whom he attacked were bound by their sacred calling to abstain from reprisals. His assaults upon the Ritualistic Clergy of England were in the highest degree ungenerous and indecent. And yet the offender was not wholly without excuse. The mere spectacle of devotion irritated worldliness. Self-sacrifice was a standing reproach to self-seeking. The very sight of men who live for an unpopular cause stings the Soldier of Fortune into a fury which he cannot, if he would, dissemble.

Sir William belonged to the old and exhausted School of Irreligious Liberalism. I mean no reproach to his private character. Like Mr. Squeers, he could justly boast of being "the right shop for morals"; but he belonged to a political school which honestly believed that Religion was the greatest mischief which could befall the individual or the State. "Destroy the Establishment! Why, it's the only thing that stands between us and Religion," cried one prophet of this school. "Things have come to a pretty pass," said another, "when Religion is allowed to invade the sphere of private life." To politicians of this type, Mr. Gladstone's ardent spirituality was an irritating puzzle; and his passionate insistence on the Christian Dogma as a guide of political action filled them with indignation and alarm. But he was indispensable, and they knew it; and so, with rage and grief in their hearts, they bowed to his yoke and followed his leadership; and, as long as Mr. Gladstone remained at the head of the Liberal party, Religion was safe from Liberal attack.

Another excuse for Sir William Harcourt's wrath against "Ritualism" (if one must borrow the nickname of current controversy) is that Ritualism stands for the spiritual independence of the Church, while Sir William was "the last of the Erastians."

"If," wrote Mr. Gladstone in 1876, "we follow the Erastian idea, it does not matter what God we worship, or how we worship Him, provided we derive both belief and worship from the civil ruler, or hold them subject to his orders. Many most respectable persons have been, or have thought themselves to be, Erastians; but the system, in the developments of which it is capable, is among the most debased ever known to man."

Of those "most respectable persons" Sir William Harcourt lived to be the sole survivor; and his performances a few years ago in the Anti-Ritualistic Crusade were the expression of a passionate desire to crush the spiritual life of the English Church, by binding her, in spite of her struggles and protestations, to the chariot-wheels of the English State. It was a criminal and hopeless enterprise, as indeed Sir William, if only he had ears to hear, might have learnt from his old friend and patron Lord Beaconsfield. "The principle that forms Free Kirks is a strong principle, and takes many forms, which the social Polyphemes, who have only one eye, cannot perceive."

In writing this paper I have been on my guard against treating

my subject in a spirit of unqualified eulogy, but I should not satisfy my own sense of justice if I left, as the final impression on my reader's mind, that very unattractive aspect of Sir William Harcourt's character which he displayed in theological disputation. I would now place the picture in other and more becoming lights.

The description of Archbishop Harcourt which I transcribed at the beginning contains not a few elements of resemblance to his grandson. Indeed, when Sir William lectured the recalcitrant clergy, I always felt that atavism is responsible for much, in that, being an Archbishop's grandson, he could not see a curate go astray, without an instinctive desire to punish him. It would be insidious to indicate the special qualities in which Sir William most closely resembled his grandfather, or those in which the resemblance was less distinct. Physically, the resemblance was almost a reproduction; and morally there were many points of similitude.

Even in respect of temper, Sir William's bark was worse than his bite; or, if I may use again the heraldic metaphor which has helped us so often, his grunt was worse than his tusk. In spite of all that has come and gone, and without retraction of anything that I have written, I affirm that he was fundamentally affectionate, generous and humane. He had a generous zeal for Peace, Freedom and Temperance. About his cleverness and his accomplishments there can be no two opinions. He was thoroughly well read, and his general culture rested on a broad and firm foundation of classical scholarship. He had the "Corpus Poetarum" and Shakespeare and Pope at his fingers' ends, and his acquaintance with the political history of England elicited a characteristic compliment from Lord Beaconsfield. It was his favorite boast that, in all his tastes, sentiments, and mental habits, he belonged to the eighteenth century, which he glorified as the golden age of reason, patriotism and liberal learning. This self-estimate strikes me as perfectly sound, and it requires a very slight effort of the imagination to conceive this well-born young Templar wielding his doughty pen in the Bangorian Controversy, or declaiming on the hustings for Wilkes and Liberty; bandying witticisms with Sheridan, and capping Latin verses with Charles Fox; or helping to rule England as a member of that "Venetian Oligarchy" on which Lord Beaconsfield lavished

all the vials of his sarcasm. In truth, it is not fanciful to say that whatever was best in the eighteenth century—its robust common sense, its racy humor, its thorough and unaffected learning, its ceremonious courtesy for great occasions, its jolly self-abandonment in social intercourse—was exhibited in the demeanor and conversation of Sir William Harcourt. He was an admirable host, and, to borrow a phrase from Sydney Smith, "received his friends with that honest joy which warms more than dinner or wine." As a guest, he was a splendid acquisition, always ready to amuse and to be amused, delighting in the rapid cut-and-thrust of personal banter, and bringing out of his treasure things new and old for the amusement and benefit of a later and less instructed generation.

Some of Sir William's quotations are so extraordinarily apt that they deserve a permanent place in the annals of table-talk. That fine old country gentleman, the late Sir Rainald Knightley, who was the living double of Dickens's Sir Leicester Dedlock, had been expatiating after dinner on the undoubted glories of his famous pedigree. The company was getting a little restive under the recitation, when Sir William was heard to say, in an appreciative aside: "This reminds me of Addison's evening hymn—

> 'And Knightley to the listening earth
> Repeats the story of his birth.'"

Surely, the force of apt citation can no further go. When Lord Tennyson chanced to say in Sir William's hearing that his pipe after breakfast was the most enjoyable of the day, Sir William softly murmured the Tennysonian line:

> "The earliest pipe of half-awakened birds."

Some historians say that he substituted "bards" for "birds," and the reception accorded by the poet to the parody was not as cordial as its excellence deserved.

GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL.

THE SELF-SUPPORTING STUDENT IN AMERICAN COLLEGES.

BY PROFESSOR ORLANDO F. LEWIS, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE.

THERE are in most American colleges three kinds of students: those who earn none of their college expenses, those who earn some and those who earn all. The proportion of non-self-supporting students is large, but large are also the numbers of the self-supporting men and women; indeed, self-support is one of the most prominent features of the American college life of to-day. It is also a most elusive subject upon which to gather information, and the following statistics and opinions concerning various phases of the subject are, in general, only the willing but frankly subjective estimates of American college presidents or their representatives.

The term "self-supporting" designates in this article both those who earn all their college expenses and those who earn only a part. The article will endeavor to treat of the self-supporting student as a "sub-freshman" or prospective collegian, of the expenses that loom up before him, of his opportunities as an undergraduate for work at the college and in the vicinity, of his earnings, his scholarship and his social standing in the college community. He is a large factor, numerically and economically, in the college world; and indeed it may be seriously asked if the typical "college man" might not be represented more truthfully by the self-supporting student than by the much more familiar hero of the college tales, illustrated weeklies and athletic fields.

Sixty college presidents or their representatives have responded to a request to furnish the statistical information given below. Several large educational divisions of the United States are fairly well represented. The North Atlantic Division is represented by 22 colleges; the South Atlantic Division by 3 colleges; the South Central Division by 4 colleges; the North Central Division by 25 colleges; and the Western Division by 6 colleges.

A regrettable absence of answers from Southern colleges makes much desirable information unavailable concerning a section of our country particularly interesting in its relation to the self-supporting white student.

"Going to college" has never been more popular than at present. The "World Almanac" for 1904 gives a total attendance of 119,496 students in our universities and colleges at the close of the college year of 1901-1902. This fall's "largest entering classes" were especially numerous; great endowments, new and mighty buildings, the development of professional schools, the newspaper interest in educational and athletic matters, and the widespread impression in our schools that college gives the best preparation for the work of life, have centered more strongly than ever the eyes of the preparatory school student upon the goal of a college education. To most students the college course seems a necessary luxury. Parents make heroic efforts to put the child through college, and the students themselves, when it is necessary, join the self-supporting army to wage, as Yale puts it, a "four years' warfare" for the four years' course.

It is difficult to estimate how many students are deterred by financial reasons from undertaking a college course. Twenty-nine colleges out of 60 do not know, or give no answer; of those replying more definitely, 19 believe many preparatory-school students would go to college if they could afford to, while 12 colleges think the number but few. And, indeed, the student who is trying to decide if he can make college expenses and earnings meet might receive "self-help" pamphlets from a score of colleges, and rise from their perusal with no definite impression save a headache. Bates College "sees no reason why a healthy, vigorous student should hesitate for financial reasons to enter"; Wesleyan University believes that "any person in good health can go through college if he will," and similar reports come from Harvard, Cornell, Ohio State University and the University of South Dakota, the president of which writes that he knows of students leaving the University for financial reasons who dressed better than he did.

But St. Lawrence University "could double its attendance in six weeks if it could assure all persons that they could earn their way without interference to their studies." Yet the University of Minnesota states that "self-supporting students are invariably

able, through the kindness of instructors if necessary, to arrange some satisfactory programme." Western Reserve University prints that, with term-time earnings and vacation opportunities, any thrifty and enterprising young man can pay his way through college. Later, in the same pamphlet, however, one who has "been through the mill" says he would not advise a boy to endeavor to earn all his college expenses, save in cases of exceptional ability in skilled work.

The fact seems to be that the exceptional self-supporting student can earn his way, as do, on an average, 25 men in each class of the Yale academical department; but most students must drop out or borrow money, as do half the students of St. Lawrence University, who fail from lack of funds to complete their college course, or those men in the University of Pennsylvania whose effort to earn money exhausts practically all their time and strength. College presidents agree that pluck, endurance and an absence of false pride are necessary, and President Thwing, of Western Reserve, says frankly that the self-supporting student must have an amount of pluck and worthy self-confidence that most men do not possess.

Two additional opinions are noteworthy. Denison University thinks that 50 per cent. of those wishing to attend college are deterred by financial *excuses,* but only 2 per cent. by financial *reasons.* Marietta College believes that many stay away from college, not because they feel they cannot make their way, but because they are unwilling to lose the time that might be devoted to business and the acquisition of financial independence.

So the tide of self-supporting students continues to flow toward the colleges, and the needy freshman finds plenty of company. From Maine to California the self-supporting students form a respectable and much-respected army. In only 4 out of 59 colleges are they estimated as falling below 10 per cent. of the total enrolment, namely, at the Universities of the South, Cincinnati, Missouri and Utah. But in Colby College, Illinois College and Baker University 90 per cent. of the students are believed to be working, wholly or partly, their way through college. Bates College and Rutgers College report 80 per cent. or over, and Dartmouth and the Universities of Vermont, Minnesota and Kansas 70 per cent. or more. Two colleges report between 60 and 70 per cent.; 11 colleges between 50 and 60 per cent.; 3 between 40

and 50 per cent.; and 9 again between 30 and 40 per cent. Harvard reports the number to be very large; the Universities of Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin have no data on hand; the University of Chicago gives over 50 per cent. Yale and the University of Pennsylvania report between 10 and 20 per cent., and Cornell University about 25 per cent.

The figures vary generally, not according to the location of the colleges, but by individual institutions. Two colleges, for instance, in Kansas report 70 and 90 per cent. respectively, and the other 35 per cent. Missouri reports 7 per cent. and Minnesota 70. By great divisions of the country, we find that the average for the 22 North Atlantic colleges is 48 per cent., for the 3 South Atlantic colleges 50 per cent., for the 4 South Central colleges only 18 per cent. The North Central Division with its 25 colleges reaches an average of 45 per cent., and the Western Division falls to 25. For 52 colleges, the percentage is 45; the 18 State universities have an average of 34, and the 34 other colleges an average of 47.

As has been stated, these figures are based upon opinions of colleges rather than upon data at their disposal. Comparatively few colleges have made careful attempts to discover the proportion of self-supporting students in their midst, although, as will be indicated later, the colleges are endeavoring more and more to meet the demands for work rising from the student army of the unemployed. Consequently, it is quite possible that an average of 45 per cent. of self-supporting students, or 53,773 in a total enrolment of 119,496, may be proved later not representative; but it is also true that the average may be either larger or smaller. The college head often cannot tell what the college hands are doing. Students are reticent about their private affairs, and, as one correspondent phrased it, the college president sees many things only through a telescope.

It is equally difficult for the prospective college student to estimate what his necessary and incidental expenses are likely to be, for not only do college expenses vary more or less according to size and location of the institution, but the estimated "low," "medium" and "high" annual expenses published in most college catalogues vary not only in what is included as necessary (tuition, registration, laboratory, gymnasium, library and other fees, board, room, etc.), but also somewhat in the degree in which they include

such other expenses as clothing, amusements, athletics, laundry, travelling, social dues, etc. So it may happen that the "necessary minimum expenses" of $105 at one college may be higher because of what is omitted than the statement of another college of $186.47. Nor can the freshman tell definitely from his neighbors' experiences. The University of California has published an exhaustive and illuminating statistical expense account of each of 76 students, prepared by the students themselves; but the total annual expenses range in this collection from $100 to about $450. Yet they are declared to represent not "average," but "low," college expenditures.

Averaging the "low" expense estimates of 58 colleges, we have $216; the "medium" estimates of 41 colleges, $340; and the "liberal" estimates of 50 colleges give us $471. It is very probable that the figures upon which the "low" average is based are sufficiently close to the really necessary expenses to make the result of some value as an approximate "national" average. "Medium" and "liberal" estimates are of course more variable. The average "low" expenses of 24 State universities are $170; of 39 other colleges, $242; the difference in favor of the State universities may be explained partly by their low or free tuition, and by the lower cost of living in the Central and Western States where the State universities are most prominent and strongest. College expenses in the East average considerably higher than elsewhere. In the North Atlantic Division 22 colleges give as a "low" average $279, 3 South Atlantic colleges $184, 4 South Central colleges $173; while 24 colleges in the North Central Division average "low" $182, and 6 Western colleges, $167.

The problem, then, before the self-supporting student is, approximately, how to earn at least $200 from September to September. He finds at the college offices only a limited amount of "work," and scores of applicants among the students. This labor problem is a constant source of anxious perplexity to the president and his secretary, or the committee on self-help. The college can, to be sure, employ a few students as janitors, bell-ringers, farm-hands, caretakers on the college grounds, and for ordinary carpentry and mechanical work. Students can act as waiters and dish-washers at the college and fraternity eating-houses; they can be proctors, monitors, theme-correctors, assistants in the laboratories, library and gymnasium; at the college

offices clerical work to a limited amount is frequently offered. But all that the college can directly offer in its own service would be but a morsel for the appetite of such a student-body as that of the University of Minnesota, for instance, with its 70 per cent. of self-supporting students. A few college presidents have unsuccessfully experimented with college woodyards, spool and chair-leg factories, etc. But the pay for college work is rarely over 20 cents an hour.

So the colleges have, in increasing numbers, done the next-best thing in instituting free "self-help" agencies, appointment bureaus on the general plan of the teachers' agencies. The student announces that he desires work, and the college bureau seeks it and recommends the student. Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Tufts, Maine, Brown, Chicago, Tulane and California are but a few of the colleges thus acting as unpaid middlemen. In this work the college branches of the Y. M. C. A. lend ever-increasing and valuable service, a general secretary being located at many of the larger universities, who, frequently at the expense of the college, canvasses the college town and neighborhood for opportunities for student employment.

The kinds of work done by students, though not unlimited in extent, are practically endless in variety. Dean Hurlburt of Harvard says that it is far easier to enumerate the things students do not do than to tell the ways in which they earn their money. The writer of this article is strongly tempted to dwell at length upon these "student industries," as offering most picturesque and suggestive commentaries upon college life; but reference can be made, fortunately, to several excellent articles treating this romantic side of the question of self-support,* and to the self-help publications of California, Chicago, Western Reserve, Columbia, Yale, Maine, Denison, Minnesota and Wesleyan.

It will be apparent upon the slightest reference to these pamphlets that the college student is not afraid to "tackle" as varied occupations as are listed in a city directory. His ingenuity, frankness, pertinacity and cheerfulness are his great stock in trade. He earns from a dollar to a thousand. He enters college with $300, and goes to his summer work with a cash balance of 30 cents; or

* "Working One's Way Through College" (two articles), by Alice K. Fallows, *Century*, vol. 44; "Through Harvard on Fifty Cents," Garrison Williams, *Saturday Evening Post*, January 13, 1900; and "How Modern College Students Work Their Way," Forrest Crissey, *Saturday Evening Post*, June 6, 1903.

he appears in September with a debt of $10 and comes into Commencement week with $25 to start him out on his summer canvassing. He does everything all the year round in all sorts of ways.

His occupations can be classed, in a rough way, as skilled and unskilled. He takes care of furnaces and lawns, houses and gardens, and receives a room and perhaps a part or all of his board; waiting on tables or washing dishes nets him from a part to all of his food. By manual labor, one Chicago student earned last year all his expenses, including tuition. A young fellow at Columbia drove a truck on Saturdays, while waiting for something better to turn up, and came to the end of the year with $350. Only a small proportion of the college expenses, however, can generally be earned at the unskilled rate of 15 to 25 cents per hour.

Between skilled and unskilled labor are found many student occupations. Students organize boarding clubs, collect bills, canvass, deliver newspapers, light street-lamps, and act at college as agents for a thousand different things. As a tourist-guide one Columbia man earned $275 in a season; a student at Minnesota paid his way through college by driving a laundry-cart twelve hours a week. A half-dozen Yale men have acted as a company of pall-bearers, and Wesleyan men have made a market for farm produce from home.

Skilled labor is remunerative. The student gravitates most readily toward tutoring; its fees are never less than 50 cents an hour, and often rise to several dollars. Columbia reports several students as thus earning in a season $850 apiece. Seventy-one students of Yale earned by tutoring in 1902-1903 a total of $8,652, an average of nearly $122. A successful life-insurance canvasser at Pennsylvania earned all his college expenses, his commissions during nine months amounting to $3,000. Lecturing, preaching, managing playgrounds and recreation centres, teaching in night-schools, newspaper reporting, clerking, running stereopticons, coaching small boys in studies and games, stenography and typewriting—such are a few of the many occupations of fairly large earning power. The general secretary of the Brown Y. M. C. A. quotes preaching as "earning from $1 to $10 per week; teaching from $1 to $3 per night (20 weeks per year, 3 to 5 evenings per week); clerking, from $3 to $5 per week, afternoons and one evening; tutoring, from 50 cents to $2 per hour; and typewriting 40 cents per hour."

The average amount earned by self-supporting students is problematical. More is earned in city colleges than in institutions in small towns; but the lower college and living expenses offset in some measure the difference. Statistics from Columbia show the earnings of 273 students, in term time during the academic year of 1902-1903, to have aggregated $39,435.57, making the average earnings of each student $144.45. When this sum is added to $163.54, the average earnings of each of 192 students during the vacation of 1903, we have some light upon what the average self-supporting student can do in one city college; his earnings are $308, about $150 less than the estimated "low" annual expenses of Columbia.

Student occupations in vacation time are even more varied than term-time "jobs," for in the summer the student is hampered by neither location nor recitation hours. Vacation is literally the student's time for making hay. He turns up everywhere, selling stereoscopic views at the Vermont side-door, harvesting in the Kansas wheat-fields, managing a summer stage-line running into the Yosemite, cooking for a Minnesota lumber-camp, setting type for a Pennsylvania county weekly. He registers you at the hotel desk, shows you to your room, seats you at the dining-table, checks your baggage, sells you your ticket, and takes in his various capacities your tip, all for the cause of education. He surveys the railroad you are travelling upon, calls out the stations, and shovels the fuel into the engine. And he travels considerably more than the majority of his college professors.

The self-supporting student must evidently exercise considerable skill in adjusting his hours of recitations and his hours of labor, that both may be carried without failure. It is an open question how much the self-supporting students are hampered by their outside work. Not all college executives state the case so strongly as does the president of St. Lawrence University, who believes it to be "simply impossible for a student to work all the time or a considerable portion of it and do good work at his studies." Bates says that "students engaged in outside work must be methodical to a degree requiring unusual decision and energy." On the other hand, Cornell University thinks that in the majority of cases the student's college work does not suffer, because the time spent in labor is taken from time otherwise devoted to idleness, pleasure or recreation; a view held also by Dickinson and Minnesota. South

Dakota believes the student can do well, if only he has earned something during the summer.

But only 3 colleges out of 59 believe that self-support is no hindrance to college work. Fifty report that outside work is somewhat hampering, or that it is a hindrance, although only 2 colleges seem to consider it seriously detrimental. A student, as at Harvard, may have to choose between competition for a possible scholarship, meaning consequent total attention to class-room work, and an actual opportunity to earn money, that means, however, renunciation of college financial aid. Not all outside work hampers the student; tutoring, assistance given in laboratory or library, night-school teaching and similar occupations are excellent training for the college man. The extremes are well indicated in two students, one of whom, at California, works several hours daily on a delivery wagon of a clothes-cleaning firm, taking the time absolutely from college work, while the other student, in post-graduate work at Chicago, stated recently to the writer that he had earned the previous season over $2,000 at tutoring in the vicinity of the University.

It takes indomitable grit to earn one's way through college, and, as Beloit puts it, entire self-support is advisable only in exceptional cases. But for him who is ready for the fight, there is encouragement in the possibility of applying to other college centres the words of Mr. R. A. Myers, secretary of the Columbia University Committee on the Employment of Students, that "a good man almost always finds employment," and that "the resources for earning money in New York city are almost unlimited, and have as yet hardly been tapped." Yet the majority of wholly self-supporting students probably find it necessary to "drop out for a year" once or twice during the college course, to earn as a motorman, machinist, book-agent, or in some other of a hundred trades, sufficient money to complete the college course. And many students do not hesitate to follow in their senior years the advice of several universities to borrow money, to be paid back as soon after graduation as possible.

Concerning the scholarship of self-supporting students, the opinions expressed are very favorable. Of 60 colleges, only 3 rate the class-room work of the laboring student as lower than that of his financially more secure colleague. On the other hand, 17 colleges believe in the higher scholarship of the self-supporting

student, and 26 other institutions state that there is at least no difference in the average rank of the two classes of students. Ten colleges "could not tell," and 4 returned no answer. It is, then, apparently, safe to assume that, although the self-supporting student may be so hampered in his work as to drop out of college sooner or later, the college generally suffers nothing by his presence, but rather gains from the standpoint of its average scholarship.

There are exceptions, of course, in both classes of students, but it is gratifying to notice the frequency of such replies as that of Yale, that 15 of the 19 highest appointments fell, in the class of 1903, to self-supporting students, although in each case they were only about 15 per cent. of their class in the graduating body from the several schools of the University. "This showing," the report continues, "is undoubtedly higher than annual averages would continue to be, but it is safe to say that the scholarship of self-supporting students is higher than that of the others."

At Columbia, Mr. Myers chose recently in alphabetical order the latest college records of 51 students that had applied for work to the Committee on the Employment of Students, and of 51 that had not so applied. Only the limited time at his disposal made impossible a comparison of the complete registration of the college. "The figures," Mr. Myers reports, "certainly give the palm to those working their way through college, and such action is probably just. But, on the other hand, I find that the sterling, wholly responsible *man* is about as hard to find among those working their way as elsewhere." And it is then suggested that all final comparisons of self-supporting and non-self-supporting students should be deferred until twenty years after their graduation.

Lehigh says, very simply, that "self-support does not affect scholarship at all. If a student devotes too much time to outside work his scholarship suffers. On the other hand, a poor student naturally has fewer diversions than a well-to-do student, and so is apt to study harder." Cornell finds, not in the self-supporting student, but in the independent student with a small allowance, the man with the highest average. So it seems evident that scholarship in general does not suffer from the effects of self-support. As Tufts puts it, "the self-supporting students have a higher sense of their responsibilities," and Dartmouth believes that the systematic work of the working students and their apprecia-

tion of an education is conducive to faithful work. The self-supporting collegian may not be able to stand the pace, but he is a good pace-maker while he lasts.

That the American college is a democratic institution, in which worth counts more than wealth, is the sentiment of many replies to the question as to the social standing of the self-supporting student. Not only are the working boys accorded college honors, but class distinction and fraternity fellowship are offered with a most satisfactory readiness to the self-supporting students. Of 59 colleges, 47 report "no difference" in social standing. Dean Hurlburt, in answering from Harvard, voices admirably the sentiment strongly expressed by many other colleges.

"At Harvard there is absolutely no difference between rich and poor, so far as social standing goes. Sometimes a man has to devote himself so closely to his studies that he has no time to take part in the social life of his class, and is known to a few only; but I believe that a man makes of himself what he wants, except when he starts out to obtain social recognition. Usually, a man of this sort fails. The thing that counts here is to be a worker in some one thing, and a man may win distinction in any way he pleases. To be taken into one of the undergraduate clubs a man must be 'clubable,' and if he is this the men ask nothing more. I have known men who have paid every cent of their way taken into societies which those in the undergraduate world who value society life think the most desirable, and men of the greatest wealth who wanted club life, but who were uncongenial, left out. . . . The part of college life I wonder most at and most admire as the years go on is its splendid democracy."

The University of California adds this word: "Any difference in social standing would arise from early training, disposition, personality, habits, tastes, and amount of time and money available for mingling in the interests and pursuits of other students. Of course, the man who is 'hard up' financially may be 'hard up' too in early training, manners and adaptability." Leland Stanford states pertinently that it depends entirely upon the class that forms the judgment.

It is hardly to be expected that the situation is the same in all colleges; there will always be students who are not thoroughly convinced of the dignity of labor. Ten of the colleges report a "slight" difference in the attitude of mind toward the self-supporting student, the Southern colleges being rather more inclined apparently to feel a distinction. Mercer University reports:

"Self-supporting students are valued by their fellows in all college matters, except possibly as regards their eligibility for fraternity membership, simply upon their individual merits. In the question of eligibility for membership in some of the fraternities and of standing socially among the ladies who are interested in college matters (we have not coeducation), ready money has its effect as elsewhere in life."

At the other extreme stands the reply from Baker University, that "the students here consider that there is a little premium upon the man or woman who works. Hence some of our students who financially do not need to work take on, nevertheless, a little labor." And at Wabash the self-supporting students are the leaders in all the student organizations. So the almost unanimous verdict of college executives as to "no difference" may be taken with the grain of salt that flavors the letters from Harvard, California, Mercer and Baker, without in the least questioning the undoubtedly vigorous presence of that "splendid democracy" in the American college student-body that is so proudly written and read in the letters just quoted.

There are many phases of the life of the self-supporting students that for reasons of space must remain untreated in this article. The health of working students, the topographical relation of their homes to their colleges, their careers after graduation would be fruitful subjects of investigation. And no study of self-support in American colleges can be complete without attention to the whole subject of the financial aid extended by the colleges in the form of scholarships, gratuities and loans. Since such aid, however, has many of the characteristics of a gift, it has been only barely touched upon in this article, which has aimed to consider the student wholly from the side of his work and its results upon his college life.

Until further statistics materially alter the results obtained from the above-mentioned statements of college executives, it may be said of the self-supporting American student that he and his fellows are going to college in large numbers, and constitute nearly one-half of the entire college student-body of the United States. It is difficult to estimate how many more students would go to college, did they feel that they could earn their college expenses; for those who undertake the "four-years' warfare" the annual expenses can be hardly less than $200. The college itself can offer to the student comparatively few opportunities for work

within its walls and boundaries, but the self-help bureau will try to find work for him that, if industriously pursued, will bring him in from $100 to $150 between September and June. This sum, added to what he can earn during the summer, should meet about two-thirds of his college expenses. His college work will be somewhat hampered by his outside labor, but if he gives to learning his lessons the same energy he devotes to earning money, his scholarship will be fully as good as the average. His social standing will not be impaired by his self-support, unless the time put upon his outside work causes him to neglect ordinary social duties and opportunities. His four years of college life may have to be extended through five from lack of funds, but if he has pluck and seriousness he can win the battle. He can count upon having the respect of president, faculty, and students, and in his hours of hard work he can console himself with the thought that his enforced labor is very probably developing within him the qualities of pluck, endurance and thoughtfulness that later on in life will stand him in excellent stead.

ORLANDO F. LEWIS.

ALIEN COLONIES AND THE CHILDREN'S COURT.

BY ERNEST K. COULTER, DEPUTY CLERK OF NEW YORK'S CHILDREN'S COURT.

THERE is probably no place where the social, physical and moral effects of the further congestion of our already overcrowded tenement districts, with the enormous and miscellaneous influx of aliens, is more immediately apparent than in New York's Children's Court. Here daily looms up, in a manner most startling, the menace of the congested immigrant colonies to our future citizenship. The army of children burglars, pickpockets and thieves, the multitude charged with less serious offences, the children without proper guardianship, come from these colonies. Practically all of the material brought into the Children's Court for remoulding is a gift from Europe. By the use of means in which there is a large measure of reason and humanity, the saving of the great majority of these children is being accomplished. But the burden that Europe is shifting to us through the steerage is daily becoming more onerous. The fact that there are thousands of children accused of crime to be dealt with is due almost altogether to the evil moral and physical conditions following the massing of immigrants in narrow districts. With the disintegration of the alien colonies in our great cities, and with the enactment of wiser immigration laws, the number of juvenile offenders would be so small that there would scarcely be need for Children's Courts. Simple, too, would be the problem of municipal charities.

A study of nationalities, just completed, shows that eighty-six per cent. of all the children arraigned in the Children's Court, which has jurisdiction over the old city of New York (Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx), were born either abroad or of

parents born in foreign countries. For our cosmopolitan metropolis this percentage may not be so striking, but the significant fact is that practically all crime among children comes from the same congested living-spots. These are the breeding-places of the great majority not only of the inmates of our reformatories, but of our charitable institutions.

The moral and physical standards of the hundreds of thousands of aliens being added to our population each year, as the Commissioner-General of Immigration himself gives warning, are falling. The flood is not from the more desirable sources, but from those where there are the greatest illiteracy and the worst living conditions. Virtually one million aliens came to this country last year. Of the 857,046 persons who came in the steerage, during the fiscal year ending on the 30th of June, 1903, more than two-thirds were from Italy, Russia and Austria-Hungary. More than one-fourth of all the arrivals could neither read nor write. This immigration is colonizing in our cities, and, worse than that, in very narrow districts in our cities. The arraignments in the Children's Court speak most forcibly as to the results in New York.

Not only is the present immigration of a much lower order, morally and intellectually, than that of the past, but in colonizing in the cities the aliens are building barriers about their settlements which are not easily penetrated by American ideas of well-being and citizenship. In these colonies they are peoples unto themselves.

The Italian knows of either the Mulberry, Mott or Bleecker Street, or "Little Italy," colonies long before he leaves his native land, and he heads for one of these directly on leaving the Barge Office. More than 250,000 of the immigrants who came to this country last year have remained in New York; and to-day most of this number will be found in the foreign colonies between the Battery and the Harlem.

In a single square mile, bounded on the west by the Bowery, on the east by Mangin Street, on the north by East Houston Street and on the south by Cherry Street, there is a Jewish population alone of 350,000.* There are 675,000 Jews in the city of

* For this information the writer is indebted to Dr. David Blaustein, Superintendent of the Educational Alliance, under whose direction a religious census of that district has just been completed.

New York, but the vast majority of the Jewish children who are arrested come from that square mile of congested humanity. So scarce is house room there that a dozen synagogues in that district are forced on the Jewish Sabbath to worship in the rear rooms of saloons, the clatter of the bars sounding in the ears of the congregations. Between 50,000 and 75,000 Jews live in the Borough of the Bronx, but rarely is a Jewish boy brought to the Children's Court from that Borough. The tenements in which they dwell there were built after laws had been enacted which prohibited the erection of rookeries such as are now the homes of nearly all of the population of the lower East Side. There is plenty of room in the Borough of the Bronx, and there children grow up in healthy freedom. Light and air are the most powerful enemies of crime.

The names of 7,647 children appeared on the Children's Court calendar in the year which ended December 31st last. More than half of these children were born in Italy or Russia, or of parents born in those countries. The offences charged ran nearly the entire gamut of the Penal Code. Birth is the fundamental test of citizenship in this country; but, in investigating the subject of immigration and juvenile crime, it is as important that the nativity of the parents be known as that of the child. The parents are responsible for the child's environment, and the environment determines whether or not the child shall start in the path to vagrancy and criminality. Is it reasonable to expect that those children who are taken into the crowded spots that are already the breeding-places of depravity and disease will have a healthy growth?

Russia leads in furnishing work for the Children's Court, with Italy a close second. Of all the children arraigned, more than twenty-six per cent. are of Russian parents. More than ninety-eight per cent. of these children of Russian parents come from the lower East Side, a vast majority, as has already been said, coming from that square mile of territory where the religious census showed that 350,000 Jews lived. It is not long since the Russian Jewish parent enjoyed the reputation of striving always to do the best that he could do for the moral as well as the physical good of his family. Their love of home was proverbial. To-day, however, with the lower order of immigration that is crowding into the Ghetto, a laxity is appearing in the moral standards set by the

parents for the children. This laxity or apathy on the part of the parents has become so apparent that the Hebrew charitable workers who visit the Children's Court view the situation with alarm. Only a few years ago, it was a remarkable fact that there were no Hebrew criminals. So small was the number of delinquent Hebrew children that it was thought it would never be necessary to build a special reformatory for them. There were Catholic and Protestant institutions for the treatment of delinquents, but the suggestion of a Jewish reformatory would have been resented. To-day the number of convictions of Hebrew children is so large that Hebrew philanthropists have subscribed a large sum of money for a protectory.

The effects of the oppression and carefully fostered ignorance in the native country are at once apparent in the Russian immigrants on their arrival here. The Russian arrivals cling to the cities; and, crippled by poverty and ignorance, as they are, what place is there for them but the slum and sweat-shop districts?

The parents have lived so long in subjection that timidity and endless patience under hardship are second nature. Too often, too, on their arrival here, both father and mother, in the fierce struggle for existence, are breadwinners. They work early and late in the sweat-shops or in their miserable tenement rooms, while their children grow up in the streets. No matter how abject the condition of the father may have been in Russia, there, at least, he was czar in his own household. But here his children find a new freedom. They learn our language much more rapidly than their parents, quickly adapt themselves to the new surroundings, bad as they are, and soon outstrip their elders. They feel a superiority to their parents, and this often comes to amount almost to contempt. So engrossed, too, are the parents in their struggle to gather in a few dollars that they do not view this slipping away from their control with the same concern as formerly.

Larceny is the common charge against the Russian children arrested. From their ranks come some of the most skilful pickpockets in the city of New York. Seldom or never is a child of Russian parents arrested for a crime of violence. But in these children the pickpocket bosses, commonly called "Fagins," find their most apt pupils. The methods by which these boys are worked into the pickpocket squads are so insidious that the boys are frequently transformed into thieves before they realize that

they have done wrong. The first lesson is usually profitable and apparently guileless. The Fagin, after winning the boy's friendship as a good-natured and liberal fellow, one day in the boy's sight drops a twenty-five-cent piece into a pocket. He then tells the boy that he may have the coin if he takes it from the pocket without being detected. The instructor is conveniently blind for four lessons. The boy has had and squandered a dollar, wealth he never before dreamed of coming into his possession. A new life has been opened up to him, but all unknown to his parents; Fagin has managed that. Soon the boy is working with the squad playing "stool to a dip," that is, he crowds while one of the other boys goes through the pedestrian's pockets or extracts the contents of a chatelaine bag. The good-natured friend by this time has become a tyrant, and rules by threats and violence. He takes ninety per cent. of the boy's pickings. Next the boy is convicted of grand larceny in the Children's Court. Fagin's dollar has been a paying investment.

Although the Italian population of New York is estimated at less than 400,000, twenty-four per cent. of all the children arraigned in the Children's Court are of Italian parents. All of these Italian children come from within the purlieus of the distinctive Italian colonies down-town, or from "Little Italy," the cities within the city, with their sunless courts, malodorous streets and fire-escapes crowded with food and clothing. About one-half of the Italian children arraigned have been born in Italy. This, of itself, tells something of the character of our present immigration. The fact that there are children to be taken along is not much of a deterrent in the rush for the United States. The children are bundled along like the packs that contain the family chattels.

The thirty dollars which the father has shown to the immigration inspectors, to enable him to get beyond Ellis Island, has frequently been borrowed from a fellow passenger, and is repaid before our new resident and prospective citizen has passed the gates of the Barge Office. The family goes into a miserable room in a tenement that is already crowded to suffocation with men, women and children. Until the father gets work, the family often subsists on the charity of relatives and friends. To many of these parents, the chief concern about their children is that they should help in the breadwinning, and the boys are let out as helpers to

bootblacks whose stands are blocks away; or, as soon as they learn how to make change, they are sent to sell papers. Their new companions of the dark stairways and busy streets teach the new arrivals how to evade the truant officers. If the boy is placed in school, it is more than likely that, after hours, he is running wild with the "gang," which exists in practically every tenement block, and whose daring leader has had more or less experience with the police. The new recruit to the "gang" is taught at the outset that the "cop" is his worst enemy. His first actual criminal experience is when he is detailed "to lay cheese it"—that is, to stand picket while his companions pry the hasp off a basement door. The parents, handicapped, as they are, by ignorance of our language, customs and laws, do not realize the dangers to which their children are exposed.

Then, too, there is a large element among the Italians who seek to have their children committed to public institutions, that they may thus be relieved of the burden of their support while they are being educated. If the city is going to insist on Giuseppe attending school, and his earning-power is thus going to be cut off or, at least, greatly diminished, his parents too often are anxious to have him committed. To them, sending a boy to a charitable or reformatory institution is sending him to "college." The colony knows all about the "college." In fact, the fame of the American "college" has spread over all of Southern Italy; and many of the parents are told before they leave for this country that they will find here institutions where their children will be educated, taught a trade, fed, clothed, and lodged all at public expense. A father or mother who has had a child committed to one of these charitable or reformatory institutions, regardless of the complaint, is often looked upon with envy by neighbors. This does not apply, of course, to all the parents in the colony; but, unfortunately, it is the attitude that is all too prevalent. Many a child has unwittingly told in the Children's Court of the collusion by which his parents hoped to have him "put away" where he would learn a trade.

Instances are many where parents have even charged their children with theft, in the hope that they would be committed. In a recent case, all parties concerned artlessly told the Court that the boy had been brought to this country only three weeks before, solely for this purpose. The justices, who in turn preside in the

court, are thoroughly familiar with all these tricks, and they have found a remedy. The law has been so amended, at their suggestion, that they may now, at their discretion, place the father of any child committed to an institution under an order to pay for the child's maintenance while there. It costs the city two dollars a week for each child sent to an institution because of improper guardianship or destitution, and $110 a year for each child committed for reformation. When a father, who is the complainant against his own boy or girl, is told that in event of commitment an order will be entered against him to pay the city for the child's maintenance, his charges frequently melt away, and under renewed questionings the culprit becomes a jewel. The amendment of the law has done much to cut down the number of "disorderly child" complaints.

The resourcefulness of some of the parents in the Italian colonies is best illustrated, perhaps, by the experience of an examiner in the Bureau of Dependent Children, who was investigating a case of alleged destitution. A wretchedly-clad woman, with a seven-months-old child in her arms, called at the Bureau recently, with a story of poverty and a husband at home dying of consumption. Her husband had but one leg, and for many weeks before the consumption developed had been without work. The mother said that, if the Department of Charities would take the child, she would seek employment, and probably be able in a few days to give her husband such food as he required. The examiner hurried down into Oliver Street. He found the consumptive in a dingy room at the top of five flights of tenement stairs. The room had been stripped of everything save the bed in which the consumptive lay, its scanty covers, and a wooden leg underneath it. The woman who had accompanied the examiner told, with a flood of tears, how everything had been pawned; they were just about to send the leg to the shop around the corner. The man was barely able to make himself understood. He had lost his leg, he said, in a blasting accident; later, the consumption had developed. That he was in the last stages of the disease, there was no doubt. But the examiner marvelled at the combination of misfortunes. He lifted the bed-covers—two legs were revealed. The consumptive had hired out his services to the parents of the child whose commitment was sought, the wooden leg had accommodatingly been loaned by a professional mendicant, who lived

in the next block. The city's charity had originally supplied the leg to its owner, but, for business reasons, he wore it only on Sundays or when he was taking a vacation. The father, who had planned all these elaborate arrangements to shift the care of his child on to the city, was at work and earning twelve dollars a week.

There are many recruits to the Italian colonies who come to this country with the intention of remaining only long enough to accumulate a few hundred dollars, a fortune to them. With this they can go back to Italy and live out the rest of their days in what to them is comfort. It is in this process of accumulating their "fortune" that it is of great assistance to them if they can rid themselves while here of the expense of maintaining their children. Parents of this class have no regrets when their children are arrested. Let it be said, however, that there are thousands of Italian parents in these colonies who are intelligent and affectionate, as well as thrifty, and who rear their children with care. But with this class the authorities have little to do.

The small number of arraignments of children of parents from the Austro-Hungarian Empire is a forcible argument for the disintegration of the foreign colonies in our cities. Austria-Hungary is the second largest source of immigration to this country, the steerage arrivals of 206,011 last year falling little below the number from Italy. The percentage of children of Austro-Hungarian parentage arraigned in the Children's Court is barely eleven. The explanation of this small showing is that there are practically no distinctive Austro-Hungarian colonies in New York. There is no common language to cement these people together in a strange land. With their thirty languages they scatter on arriving here, and are quickly absorbed into widely separated districts, where often they find only a few who speak their tongue. Those who speak German seek out the German districts; the Bohemians disappear into the small Slavonic colonies, as do the Poles. The Dalmatians are swallowed up among the Greeks and Italians. Because of this scattering and the fact that the number is comparatively small of those who go into the colonies which respond least readily to American influences, the children of Austria-Hungary give the authorities little trouble.

There has been a heavy falling off of both Irish and German immigration in recent years. This is to be regretted, for past ex-

perience has shown that that immigration is of a desirable class. The percentage of arraignments of children of Irish parents, however, is about ten. Only 8.07 per cent. of all the children arraigned are of German parents. Great Britain, and this includes Canada and the British West Indies, gives a percentage of only three, while France has a percentage of less than one.

The percentage of children arraigned whose parents were born in the United States is 13.66. This includes the negroes, whose percentage of the total arraignments is 3.86. The percentage, then, of white children brought into court whose parents are known to have been born in the United States is 9.80. A large portion of these come from the densely populated "Hell's Kitchen" district. In fact, four per cent. of all the children arraigned in the Children's Court come from that small section on the West Side. In a number of cases, 2.27 per cent. of the arraignments, the children had been born in this country, but the nativity of the parents could not be ascertained. Little more than one per cent. of the children arraigned were of parents from countries other than those which have been named.

From the standpoint of the Children's Court, and with the welfare of city children in view, there is no more important municipal problem to-day than the distribution of arriving immigrants to the less densely populated sections of the city. With the powerful influences of the steamship companies at work at Washington against immigration legislation, Congress is slow to give relief. In the mean time, our future citizenship is in peril.

Recommendations have been made for measures to encourage arriving aliens to move on to the open places of the West. However attractive this proposed solution of the problem may sound, the fact confronts us that the aliens do, and will continue to, cling to the cities. Crops may go to waste for lack of harvesters, but there will always be thousands clamoring for places in sweatshops and for peddlers' licenses. The foreigners are in the cities and there they are likely to remain.

With further building of parks and widening of streets, more light and air will be let into the dense, alien colonies, and thousands will be forced into the outlying districts, where the new building laws compel the erection of more wholesome dwelling-places. The aliens will not leave the old colonies until driven to it. The fifty or seventy-five thousand Jews who have

moved into the Bronx, with resulting benefit to themselves and their children, have gone there of necessity. The East Side Ghetto could not hold them. Months had passed without a single "to-let" sign having been seen in the windows of its tenements.

The task of the authorities in combating the evils of congestion has been and will continue to be an arduous one; the inertia of ignorance and sloth is always hard to overcome. Not the least among the factors potent in this work will be the Children's Court. There, crime and poverty, ignorance and neglect, on the one side, and the law, humanity, charity and reason, on the other, are daily in conflict, with a resulting flood of light on city conditions, and the saving of many children.

ERNEST K. COULTER.

THE AUSTRALIAN TELEGRAPH SYSTEM.

BY HUGH H. LUSK.

THE people of Australia own their own telegraph system, and it is managed as a part of the postal system of the country. This arose in the beginning from the fact that, when telegraphs were first constructed, no private company would have taken the risk of making telegraphic communication pay a dividend on the capital required to construct and work the lines. As in the case of the railroads, the choice lay between telegraphs constructed and managed by the Government, and no telegraphs at all; and the people of Australia adopted a system of Government ownership. Each of the five colonies into which the great island-continent was divided began the construction of telegraph lines, and pushed them forward as fast as the spread of population appeared likely to make any return on the outlay. Australia has always been a wealthy country, and especially so since the gold discoveries of half a century ago, and it has always had a tendency to be lavish rather than niggardly in all matters of public expenditure. This tendency has been illustrated in its telegraph system as much perhaps as anywhere. Lines were made, and afterwards extended, in districts where the demand seemed to be small, and where the population was certainly scanty, to an extent which would not have commended itself to the business instincts of a great corporation, and could not have been expected to yield a large return on the capital invested. The result has been that Australia, more than any other country in the world, presents a field for investigating the effects that may be expected to flow from the public ownership of a great public convenience like the telegraph system of to-day.

The whole question was brought into prominence by the debates that took place in the Federal Parliament, in con-

nection with the passage of the new Postal Act of the Commonwealth. In each of the colonies—now the States of the federation—the telegraph had always been treated as a part of the post-office system; and, therefore, when the Federal Constitution was framed, it was agreed, as a matter of course, that the lines should go to the Commonwealth instead of remaining the property of the States, like the railroads. The fact that the colonies had been wholly distinct had led to considerable differences both in administration and in charges, and the purpose of the new Postal Act was to establish uniform rates throughout the Commonwealth on a scale that should at once be liberal to the users and fair to the revenue. It was natural, therefore, that the whole question of cost, management and charges should be thoroughly ventilated in the debates on the measure before it became law.

The circumstances of Australia, and the conditions of its settlement, have had the effect of making both its railroads and its telegraphs unusually extensive in comparison with the numbers of its population, and this is markedly the case with its mileage of telegraph lines. At present, the great island is only settled on a strip of country bordering on the coast, and even that strip does not include the more northern shores either on the East or West, and takes in no part of the north side at all. The consequence is that a line of telegraph which connects the settlements of Queensland on the northeast of Australia with those of West Australia on the west coast—a distance, in a direct line, of about two thousand five hundred miles—covers fully double that distance from the necessity of keeping in touch with the settled districts. There is, indeed, one line of telegraph which of necessity ignores this rule, and passes for nearly its whole length of about seventeen hundred miles from the south to the northwestern corner of the island, through an unsettled country. The purpose of this line is to connect settled Australia with the rest of the world by way of Java and India, and it passes through great districts of the interior, which were first explored for the purpose of its construction. Under the circumstances, it was not possible that telegraph facilities could be supplied in Australia on a small scale, or at a trifling cost.

The telegraph lines now owned and operated by the Federal Government for the people of Australia, have a length of fully

48,000 miles, while the length of the wires is considerably more than a hundred thousand miles. Thus, it will be seen, the people of Australia and their Government have a considerable experience of the cost both of constructing and operating a telegraph system. The mileage of their lines is actually greater than that of any European country with the exception of Russia, Germany and France; while, in proportion to the number of the inhabitants, it is probably nearly six times as great as that of any other country in the world, with the single exception of its near neighbor, New Zealand. There are upwards of three thousand telegraph stations kept open for the convenience of a population which does not exceed four millions; and the revenue derived from messages is shown to be sufficient to defray the cost of operating and maintaining the lines, as well as defraying the interest charges on the cost of construction at the annual rate of three per cent.

Under the circumstances, it would be natural to suppose that the charges for telegraphic service in Australia must be very high, and it is here that the debates in the Commonwealth Parliament, and the schedule of rates finally appended to the Act, throw an unexpected light on the question. It appears that in no part of Australia has the cost of telegraphy ever been high, and the rates now adopted as those which will secure the revenue from loss under the three heads of operating, maintaining, and paying interest on the money invested, are remarkably moderate when compared with those in force in most parts of the world, and not least in America. The rates finally settled were these: For town and suburban messages—suburban meaning practically a radius of ten miles beyond the city limits—the rate fixed is twelve cents for a message not exceeding sixteen words, which includes the address and signature. For messages to any point within the same State from which they are sent, the charge is fixed at eighteen cents for the same number of words. For messages to any other State within the Commonwealth, the charge for a message of similar length is twenty-four cents. In all cases, the charge for extra words beyond the sixteen is a uniform rate of two cents a word. Delivery is made within a radius of one mile from the receiving office, and for this there is no extra charge.

It will be seen at once that these charges are remarkable for

their moderation, in comparison with any experience the people of America have yet had; they are, in fact, lower for the service rendered, and the distances traversed, than the rates established in any other country except New Zealand, but they are fully justified by the experience of the three principal States of the Commonwealth—New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland—the tariffs of which have practically been adopted. When it is remembered that Australia, as a whole, is a country of the same area as the United States, and that the distances actually traversed are very much greater than those between any points of telegraph communication in America, it will be seen that the charge of twenty-four cents for a sixteen-word message is very much less than one-half, and would probably work out at about one-third, the amount charged in America. The great area of the five States occupying the mainland—three of the five being each more than two and a-half times as large as Texas, and a fourth four-fifths of its size—renders the State rate of eighteen cents for similar messages equally cheap compared with American rates; while the city and suburban tariff of twelve cents has no parallel in American experience.

The question which naturally arises at once is: How is it done? We have here a population of four millions of white men, scattered along a coastal belt of country some five thousand miles in length, with widely separated centres of population, enjoying the most modern facilities of communication to an extent far greater in proportion to their numbers, and at less than half the cost at which the same facilities are supplied to a population nearly twenty times as great and far less widely scattered. At the first glance there seems to be no reasonable way of accounting for the difference. To the advocates of public ownership and management of the great necessaries of modern civilized life, it would seem that the problem is by no means so serious. In the course of the debate in the Australian Federal Parliament, the Postmaster-General of the Commonwealth stated boldly that not only was the Australian telegraph system as efficient as any in the world, and, with the single exception of that of New Zealand, by far the cheapest, but that it was so owing to its public ownership, and to the economies naturally attending the system. A very brief examination of the facts will show that this claim is at any rate very largely founded on facts.

The three branches of expenditure dealt with by the Australian Minister for Postal Services were, the interest on the cost of constructing the lines, the cost of maintaining the lines in good order when constructed, and the working expenses of the service —including, of course, salaries of officials and workmen of all grades, office expenses and rentals, and the supply of electricity. Every telegraph system must provide for all these in some form or other, but a Government system, if honestly worked in the public interests, as the postal system is in this and other civilized countries, has great advantages in the direction of economy in two out of the three branches of expenditure. In the first place, the credit of a whole people is always better than the credit of any part of it, and therefore loans required by nations with a stable government, and a reasonable character for honesty, can always be obtained on the most favorable terms. Australia is a young though a wealthy community, and as a rule the value of money is somewhat higher there than in older countries; but the $18,000,000 of borrowed money spent by its various Colonial Governments on the construction of telegraph lines costs to-day, in interest, only a small fraction beyond three per cent. It need hardly be pointed out that such a return as this would not meet the views of any great mercantile corporation. It may fairly be said that the expenses coming under the second head of telegraph expenditure —that is to say, the actual cost of producing the necessary supply of electricity—would be quite as little in private hands as it could be made in the hands of a Government department. This, of course, is true; but there is no reason why it should be any less, except the foolish and shameful one that intelligence and honesty are not to be obtained for the service of the public. It is in the third class of the expenditure requisite for conducting a telegraph system, however,—the department of salaries and office expenses—where, it is claimed, the advantage of public ownership becomes an element of startling magnitude.

In Australia, the telegraph and telephone services are both incorporated with the Post-Office, and as such they require few, if any, separate offices. There are fully three thousand telegraph stations in the country for the convenience of the public, and nearly every one of these is also the district post-office. There are in the United States about 27,000 telegraph stations, but there are not less than 77,000 post-offices for the use of the people:

that is to say, there is a post-office for every thousand, but a telegraph station for every three thousand. In the newer, poorer, and far less thickly settled country of Australia, there are fully six thousand post-offices to meet the requirement of four millions of people—or one to every 666 people; and more than three thousand of these are also telegraph stations—being one to about 1,300 persons. The contrast is suggestive, but it is most suggestive of all in its financial aspect. If every second post-office in this country were also a telegraph station, the public would be nearly as well supplied with the means of rapid communication as the settlers in Australia now are, instead of one third as well, and they would also be saved a great deal of money. In America it would then be, as it now is in the Commonwealth of the South Pacific—each telegraph station would be at the natural centre of population, where it would require no separate offices, and no separate staff of clerks and operators, except in cities of considerable size. Every country postmaster or clerk would in that case be required also to be a competent telegraph operator, and thus an endless duplication both of offices and officials would be avoided.

It is in this way that the Australian Postmaster-General accounts for the cheapness of his telegraph system when compared with the cost in other and older countries—but this is not all. The cost of production is low, and the machinery for carrying on the service is economical, indeed, but these things alone would not enable him to make both ends meet. The secret of its success is not only that it is economically conducted; not only that it is not loaded with heavy interest and big dividends; but, more than either, because it is appreciated and made use of by the people to an extent unknown where charges are higher, and conveniences are less. Of European nations Great Britain makes most use of the telegraph, but her population is concentrated within a small area and, therefore, is easily reached: her people use the telegraph to the extent of rather more than *two* messages a year for every inhabitant of the country. In the United States the population is more scattered and therefore more difficult to reach; three years ago the American people sent as nearly as possible *one* message over the telegraph wires for each inhabitant. In Australia population is more widely scattered than in America, and vastly more so than in England; yet three years ago *two and a half* mes-

sages for every inhabitant of the country passed over the telegraph wires of the Government. There is, it appears from the statement of the Australian Postmaster-General, only one country in the world that has supplied greater telegraphic facilities for its people, and has charged even lower rates than those of Australia, and that is the neighboring country of New Zealand. There, he admits, the Government supplies a post-office for every five hundred people, and a telegraph station for every eight hundred, and there too the rates are somewhat lower than even in Australia: he also adds, and the addition is a significant one, that there the people three years ago sent *four* telegrams for each inhabitant, and the revenue from the telegraphs was even more satisfactory than in Australia.

The lesson taught by the experience of Australia, and enforced by the official head of its postal department, is by no means a new one. It is, after all, neither more nor less than the stock argument in favor of the system of Trusts, which are advocated as a practical necessity in these days of competition, because, owing to the greatness of the scale on which they operate, they can save immensely on the cost of working, and therefore can, presumably, afford to give the public a better article at a lower price. This is exactly what, the Australian Postmaster-General asserts (and apparently beyond the reach of contradiction), the system of Government telegraphy does for the people of Australia. Only by the operation of this great public Trust, managed for the people by the people, would it be possible in a new country, of wide extent and thinly populated, to supply the facilities for speedy and reliable communication, except at a cost so enormous as to be prohibitory. Only by giving the public the facilities which such a public Trust alone can give, can they be induced to use the convenience on a scale so large as to make it pay. Such would seem to be the experience of Australia, and to even a greater extent of New Zealand.

HUGH H. LUSK.

IS THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY INSINCERE?

BY JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

JUSTLY or unjustly, there are laid at the door of the present Republican Administration serious charges of an arbitrary exercise of power, of the usurpation by the Executive of legislative functions, of unconstitutional acts, and of a general tendency not alone toward a centralization of power in the general Government at Washington, but toward a personalization of government in Mr. Roosevelt.

To all these charges a denial is interposed; and it is asserted with great frequency and emphasis by those high in the councils and confidence of the Republican Party, and by the President himself, that the Democratic Party in making these charges, and in its present appeal for popular support, is guilty of insincerity.

It remains with the great body of voters, who are not partisans from interest or habit, and whose support is essential to the success of either candidate, to pass upon these grave issues, submitted to them as to a great and impartial jury for their verdict.

As to the great, far-reaching significance of that verdict there should be no misapprehension.

If favorable to the Republican Party, it will be an approval, or at least a condonation, of acts which have been the subject of so much heated discussion for the past few months, and a deliberate acquiescence in the policy of that party, carried out through its accidental but accredited representative.

The acts of the agent, even if unauthorized and in excess of his delegated powers, will then have been ratified by the principal, and that principal will no longer be the Republican Party, but the American People.

The momentous question is whether we are prepared for that kind of an endorsement of the Republican Party.

It may be that we have come to a pass where such a distinct departure from precedents which have heretofore been our guide is defensible; but we need a good deal more to bring this home to us as a conviction than the specious insistence that a condemnation of the acts complained of will necessarily mean their undoing.

No such argument is entitled to serious consideration. On the contrary, under principles controlling with our courts and sanctioned by general usage, if rights have vested and rules of property, or even of conduct, have been established under acts indefensible in themselves but done with apparent authority, it may be that the acts in whole or in part must stand. The questions, however, whether such acts shall stand because these rights have vested and these rules have been established, or whether they shall stand as accepted precedents because the acts are right and defensible in themselves, give rise to wholly different answers. Even if every one of such acts must stand, the issue as to the character of these acts is not a dead, but a living, issue; for the issue then is not the thing done, but the principle pursuant to which it was done. Unless the Republican Party can so successfully defend its acts that the justification for its conduct is complete, without recourse to the argument as to the embarrassment which might follow a refusal to endorse these acts, then that party is not entitled to our support.

The just and the only legitimate method of applying the test of approval or disapproval to these acts is to consider what the people of the United States would do if Mr. Roosevelt were seeking election on a platform which set forth as part of its policy an intention to carry out, precisely as they were carried out, all those acts of which grave complaint is now made.

It is certain that Mr. Roosevelt cannot fairly object to this test, and it is equally certain that, in this way, we shall view these acts in a new and a rather startling light.

Let us, at the outset, fix upon the proper, justifiable methods for conducting such an inquiry.

We are not to be misled by the plausible claim that, at most, the departure from law and tradition is apparently insignificant. In the consideration of an unconstitutional or an indefensible act by an Executive or by a Legislature, the question is not what harm it may do, or how grave a departure from constitutional

principles or accepted tradition and precedent it may be, nor what are the motives which prompted the departure.

The question is whether there is any departure at all.

In our courts of law, invalid testamentary trusts, under statutes relating to the disposition of property, are not confined to those cases where it is apparent that the provisions must offend against the statute. The possibility of such a result is sufficient. So, also, our courts, finding a contracting party interested in the subject-matter of his trust, permit neither court nor jury to consider the transaction from the standpoint of its resulting injury or benefit. They condemn the transaction wherever the prohibited relation is disclosed.

Much more is great caution to be observed where the question under consideration is one involving the good faith of a nation, or the slightest assumption by an Executive of unconstitutional powers, or an inclination on his part to disregard constitutional limitations. The extent or degree of the offence is not of controlling moment. That it exists at all is sufficient to call for instant condemnation.

An occasion once arose where the President of the United States had undertaken merely to take from one of the Cabinet officers of the Government the right of determining where the public money should be deposited, and to exercise that function himself. Webster then uttered these words:

"It was strongly and forcibly urged, yesterday, by the honorable member from South Carolina, that the true and only mode of preserving any balance of power in mixed governments is to keep an exact balance. This is very true, and to this end encroachments must be resisted at the first step. The question is, therefore, whether, upon the true principles of the Constitution, this exercise of power by the President can be justified. Whether the consequences be prejudicial or not, if there be an illegal exercise of power it is to be resisted in the proper manner. Even if no harm or inconvenience results from transgressing the boundary, the intrusion is not to be suffered to pass unnoticed. Every encroachment, great or small, is important enough to awaken the attention of those who are entrusted with the preservation of a constitutional government. We are not to wait till great public mischiefs come, till the government is overthrown, or liberty itself put into extreme jeopardy. We should not be worthy sons of our fathers were we so to regard great questions affecting the general feeling. Those fathers accomplished the Revolution on a strict question of principle. The Parliament of Great Britain asserted a right to tax the Colonies in all cases whatsoever; and it was pre-

cisely on this question that they made the Revolution turn. The amount of taxation was trifling, but the claim itself was inconsistent with liberty; and that was, in their eyes, enough. It was against the recital of an Act of Parliament, rather than against any suffering under its enactments, that they took up arms. They went to war against a preamble. They fought seven years against a declaration. They poured out their treasures and their blood like water, in a contest against an assertion which those less sagacious and not so well schooled in the principles of civil liberty would have regarded as barren phraseology or mere parade of words. They saw in the claim of the British Parliament a seminal principle of mischief, the germ of unjust power; they detected it, dragged it forth from underneath its plausible disguises, struck at it; nor did it elude either their steady eye or their well-directed blow till they had extirpated it and destroyed it to the smallest fibre. On this question of principle, while actual suffering was yet afar off, they raised their flag against the Power to which, for purposes of foreign conquest and subrogation, Rome, in the height of her glory, is not to be compared; a Power which is dotted over the surface of the whole globe, with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun, and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England.

"The necessity of holding strictly to the principles upon which free governments are constructed, and to those precise lines which fix the partitions of power between different branches, is as plain, if not as cogent, as that of resisting, as our fathers did, the strides of the parent country against the rights of the Colonies; because, whether the power which exceeds its just limits be foreign or domestic, whether it be the encroachment of all branches on the rights of the people, or that of one branch on the rights of others, in either case the balanced and well-adjusted machinery of free government is disturbed, and, if the derangement go on, the whole system must fall."

Nor, again, are we to be held to any strict requirement of proof as to the motives for such acts.

Motives are elusive, and, whether the acts were committed from good or from wrong motives is not a question of first importance.

The Presidency of the United States is a trusteeship held for its beneficiary—the people of the United States. The rules laid down for the guidance of the Trustee are found in the Constitution, in our statutes, in the decisions of our courts and in precedents established by a long course of national conduct. No one but the beneficiary has given, or could give, to the Trustee a license to depart from these rules. The President does not create these rules—he obeys them. It may have been the intention of the President—and we should be prepared to concede much to one

of his high character—to do justice always; but the people of this country cannot be expected to acquiesce in the attempt of the Executive to make laws, however just, rather than to execute laws as they exist, any more than they would be content that courts of law should discard all precedents, and attempt to render decisions according to some freshly devised theory of right and wrong, as each case arose for decision.

We are free, in matters such as are now under discussion, to rest our final judgment on a foundation much less substantial than that of established proof of facts. The present inquiry is not similar to a trial in a court of law. It may be likened rather to the proceedings of an investigating committee of a legislature, where impressions, at times even hearsay, and a general course of conduct are all properly to be taken into consideration and given due weight.

Only in this case all these conditions are much more applicable, for the question at issue is what hereafter shall be our standards for national conduct, and the investigating committee is the American People.

We are to determine whether the Republican Party is entitled to our endorsement in much the same way in which we come to a conclusion as to the character of an individual.

From a consideration of these acts, not as isolated or unrelated, but in association with other acts, and from the character of the defence interposed, we are to conclude whether the charges against the Administration of Mr. Roosevelt are just.

We must bear in mind that the acts complained of find their source and inspiration and their defence in the doctrine of centralization, which is the creed of the Republican Party, and that the personalization of government is the natural but the dangerous offspring of centralization. The imperceptible but resistless drift of legislation for which the Republican Party is responsible, and of much judicial interpretation of that legislation and of the Constitution itself, promoted and sanctioned by Republican doctrine, has to-day stripped the several States of much of their individuality, so that in some vital essentials they are no longer States, but mere Boroughs.

Chief-Justice Marshall, a man whose views were not always in accord with those of Jefferson, the founder and apostle of Democracy, said:

"No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and of compounding the people into one common mass."

If we are prepared to stand idly by and see, not dreamers but men, active, aggressive, in the control of a great party, and of the machinery of government, break down these lines, then we have enthroned new leaders and exalted wholly new standards.

Nor are we to be turned aside from an investigation of these questions by a recital of past shortcomings of the Democratic Party.

We are not dealing with offences of either party, other than those which are of vital import in this election. The Democratic Party has often come short of its high purposes; it has disappointed its followers and forfeited their support. But it has recanted its errors; it has returned to its old allegiance, and has consecrated itself anew to its old articles of faith. Whether it is sincere in this must be gathered largely from what it has to say as to the conduct of the Republican Party during the past few years, and from the kind of candidate it has offered for the suffrages of the American People.

And, finally and above all, in such an inquiry we are to resolve all doubts not in favor of the Republican Party or of Mr. Roosevelt, but of the Nation.

In the light of these suggestions, let us apply the test suggested and inquire briefly whether, if it were now proposed by the Republican Party to pursue the course it has adopted and to commit the acts now complained of, we should give or withhold our approval.

Let us suppose, therefore, that the announced intention of the Republican Party in its platform were, if successful in this canvass:

That the President of the United States would, after a refusal by Congress to pass a pension law, put into force Pension Order No. 78, which was a substitute for such legislation;

That the party should announce that over remote territorial possessions, which were acquired and which can be held only by a vast navy, our flag was to float for the protection of subjects against internal disorder, and not as a symbol of American citizenship;

That the building of the Panama Canal was to be compassed

by a resort to practices which, it would not be difficult to establish, would involve a breach of faith with another nation, coupled with an arbitrary unconstitutional act;

That the President would devise the new political expedient of a constructive recess of Congress to secure, out of all order of legitimate preferment, the appointment of a friend to a major-generalship of the United States Army;

That he would in a series of addresses throughout this country advocate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would, if adopted, operate to so obliterate State lines, that the "compounding of the people into one common mass" would be seriously threatened;

That we were to be treated to episodes of the "We want either Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead" order; and that we were to have our navy move from point to point, not for display or discipline, but for threatened action;

That weak but independent nations were to be lectured and threatened, as by a pedagogue armed to the teeth, about their manners and their debts, in language like the following used by Mr. Roosevelt:

"Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendliness. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with decency in industrial and political matters, if it keeps order and pays its obligations, then it need fear no interference from the United States. Brutal wrong-doing or an impotence which results in the general loosening of the ties of civilized society may finally require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the United States cannot ignore its duty;"

That we were thus to see the Monroe Doctrine evolved into a new doctrine that is entitled in all justice to be baptized the Roosevelt Doctrine;

And that, generally, a centralized, a personalized, and a kind of *vi et armis* theory of government was to be set up for our worship;

What, under such conditions, would the people do at this Election?

Unless this Administration can stand this test of its acts—disassociated wholly from any consideration of the inadvisability or impracticability of undoing what has been done—it must be condemned, and condemned utterly.

The limitations of a magazine article forbid anything like an

extended discussion of these questions. The answer to some is apparent without discussion. The answer to others is equally apparent if we trace these acts to their source and inspiration, in the chief article of faith of the Republican Party, the centralization of government; for, from the centralization of government, it is only one and a very short step to the personalization of government, and from the latter the step is imperceptible to a Government which shall act upon personal caprice and be on the borderland, and perhaps within the province, of indifference to all law and precedent.

Though the scheme was immature and died in birth, nothing could better illustrate the way in which the Constitution is regarded by Mr. Roosevelt than what he did, a year or two ago, in the matter of a proposed amendment to the Constitution, advocated by him, not once, but in a series of speeches throughout the country.

In order that there should be centred in Washington a control over large corporations, Mr. Roosevelt proposed and advocated, over and over again, an amendment to the Constitution on the ground that:

> "Our Constitution was framed when the economic conditions were so different that each State could easily be left to handle the corporations as it saw fit."

With the evil which might result from any such interpretation of the Constitution the evil, however great it may be, of large corporations is not to be compared.

To the United States Constitution we look as the source of authority and power, and, not finding them there, they belong to the States, and not to Congress, nor to the President. Under any other interpretation the whole theory of the Constitution would be reversed, for the Constitution would thus be given the force and effect of a State Constitution, which is looked to for prohibitions upon legislative and executive action. From this the step is easy, not alone to the promulgation of immature schemes for reshaping and tinkering with the Constitution, but also to an interpretation which may be the basis for even lawlessness.

The end of Mr. Roosevelt's plan was to give a definite control, as he expressed it, to "Some Sovereign" over our large corporations, and therefore over the great bulk of our commercial transactions; the means by which he proposed to carry out his plan was

a scheme, substantially, to obliterate State lines. The erroneous theory upon which the amendment was sought to be justified was, that when the Constitution was framed, each State was in a position where it could easily be "left to handle" the corporations within its limits as it saw fit. But no one "left" anything to the States. On the contrary, the powers of the Federal Government represent simply the sum total of the concessions from the several States. The States retained what they did not part with. This is not a technical and over-refined distinction. It is fundamental, and on it rests one of the underlying principles of construction of the Constitution, and by the express language of the Constitution itself, among its first amendments, it was provided that:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There has been extended debate concerning the Pension Order of Mr. Roosevelt, but much of it is irrelevant. Comparatively, the question as to how much money the Pension Order takes from the Treasury of the United States is not of such great concern; the question of importance is how much has it taken away from the constitutional foundation on which this Government rests. A reference to any precedent set by Mr. Cleveland or by Mr. McKinley is of little moment, because the conditions were different. But assume that they were in part similar, they did not act immediately prior to a political convention at which either was a candidate, nor by a usurpation of the legislative function, when the whole subject was under consideration by Congress. There were at least four pension bills pending in Congress—three or more in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate—when this order was promulgated. All of these bills were of similar import and one of them was in effect the same as the Pension Order. The mere pendency of such bills was evidence that, in the opinion of Congress, legislation was essential to authorize the act which the order of Mr. Roosevelt sought to accomplish.

The proposed legislation failed of enactment. Then the President took the matter into his own hands, and authorized or approved the order which operated as having the effect of a law which Congress had declined to enact.

If a corporation, having sought and having failed to secure legislative authority for the carrying out of some corporate pur-

pose, thereupon lawlessly puts its scheme into effect, could it reasonably look for anything but condemnation of its course? Much less can the President expect to escape like condemnation, for he is violating the plain letter of the Constitution, no matter what his motive may have been. The question fairly to-day before the voters of the United States is: Suppose the candidate of the Republican Party should announce that, if elected to the Presidency, he would, in the event that certain pension bills in Congress failed of passage, authorize or sanction and then defend the issue of an order which was to have all the force and effect of a legislative act.

Would the people of the United States, in the face of such a declaration, elect Mr. Roosevelt? There is no middle ground. Mr. Roosevelt's defence cannot stop short of such an endorsement. If we should not be prepared to authorize in advance such a performance, Mr. Roosevelt does not deserve election, simply because the revocation of the order might now operate as an injury to many people entitled to the lasting gratitude and consideration of the nation.

How can the act be regarded as being other than what it was termed in the Senate of the United States, "a piece of Executive Legislation"?

It was stated, too, in the Senate, with much emphasis and with equal truth, that the order was taken bodily from the Bill, and was issued when it became evident that the Bill was not likely to become a law. And it was issued on the eve of a Presidential convention at which Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate for nomination.

The order reads:

"Ordered, (1) In the adjudication of pension claims under said act of June 27th, 1890, as amended, it shall be taken and considered as an evidential fact, if the contrary does not appear, and if all other legal requirements are properly met, that when a claimant has passed the age of 62 years he is disabled one-half in ability to perform manual labor, and is entitled to be rated at $6 per month; after 65 years, at $8 per month; after 68 years, at $10 per month, and after 70 years, at $12 per month."

One of the pending Bills reads as follows:

"That every officer or enlisted man in the Army or Navy of the United States coming within the provisions of the second section of the act of June 27th, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9th, 1900, who is or may become 62 years of age shall be pensioned under said acts at $6 per

month, and every one who is or may become 65 years of age shall be pensioned at $8 per month; those who are or may become 68 years of age shall be pensioned at $10 per month, and those who are or who may become 70 years of age shall be pensioned at $12 per month."

An attempted reply in part is that Judge Parker has announced that, if elected, he will recall the order and will favor the enactment of an old-age pension law, which will, it is claimed, make a drain upon the Treasury greater than that brought about by Mr. Roosevelt's act. But this is no reply. Judge Parker is advocating a law to be passed by Congress; he is not proposing to usurp the province of Congress. The people of the United States can afford to pay many millions of dollars annually to those who defended the Union. They can afford to pay no tribute to an unconstitutional act or to an exhibition of arbitrariness and a defiance of public opinion and of the legislative will. The President of the United States is expected to be the servant of the people,—not their master.

There may have been a great pressure upon the Administration to do what it did, and its enthusiasm, and not alone its political interests, may have run with the pressure, but we are not required to be content with an Administration which is "the slave of circumstance and impulse."

To the extent that rights may be said to have vested under such an order we must, under the familiar principle of law to which we have referred, see that, in setting the matter right, it be done without prejudice to those who might be embarrassed by the change. To that end a law substantially requisite to replace an unlawful order is defensible, even though the law involves the outgo of more money from the Treasury than would have been necessary but for the promulgation of the order.

Suppose, again, that the Republican Party should announce in its platform that it intended to secure the right to build the Panama Canal in the way in which that project has been begun. Then the question would be, not "What are you going to do about it, now that the act has been committed?" but "What will you do by way of conferring original authority for the act?"

It would then be set forth in the platform of the Republican Party, that its candidate for President of the United States, if elected, would seek to increase our commercial prosperity by promoting the building of the Panama Canal, if possible, by treaty

with Colombia; that, if he failed in this, he would refuse to obey the Spooner Act, which enjoined his then entering upon negotiations for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; that if, in the course of the negotiations with Colombia, that part of Colombia within which is included the Panama route should revolt, he would forthwith recognize the insurgents as a Republic, and that, if Colombia should seek to repossess itself of the territory which had been thus torn from its rightful owner, the President of the United States, under the guise and pretence—for it is nothing else—of keeping a covenant of peace under a treaty to the rights of which Colombia had succeeded, would by threat and force of arms, and, by a bold usurpation of authority vested only in Congress, to all intents and purposes declare war upon Colombia and forbid that attempt; that the Republican Party would thereupon put a premium of $10,000,000 upon rebellion, by a payment of that sum to a band of insurgents; and, lastly, and worst of all, that this course toward a weak sister nation would be defended, on the ground that such nation was obdurate and unreasonable, and that by any other course the construction of the inter-ocean waterway would have been long postponed.

Would the people then elect Mr. Roosevelt upon such an issue? Would they vote for that kind of a canal? Would they vote to have the Constitution overriden and war declared, not by Congress, but as completely by the caprice of a President as it is by that of any ruler on the Continent of Europe, hedged in by no constitutional restraint? This is no idle academic question before us. The gravity of the issue cannot be exaggerated. If the American People are not prepared to go so far as to say they would now confer original authority for such a defiance of the Constitution, then the candidate of the party responsible for this act is not entitled to be elected simply because the act cannot be wholly undone.

It is said that we did not promote the rebellion in Panama. The disclaimer of preliminary information on the subject by the Administration is confined to the statement by the President in his report to Congress, in January, 1904, that, save for certain official information and reports accompanying the message,

> "no one connected with this Government had any previous knowledge of the revolution, except such as was accessible to any person of ordinary intelligence who read the newspapers and kept up a current acquaintance with public affairs."

Now there is brought to light a letter, written on October 10, 1903, at the White House, to a friend, in which, among other things, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"I cast aside the proposition made at this time to foment the secession of Panama. Whatever other governments can do, the United States cannot go into the securing, by such underhand means, the cession."

Who made the proposition thus cast aside, and under what auspices was it made? What was the suggestion as to co-operation by us in promoting the secession of Panama, and what was to be the consideration to us? These are pertinent questions, and will, perhaps, have to be answered some day.

But the immediate questions are, why was there not laid before Congress all the information, or at least as much of it as was communicated to a friend, concerning this political intrigue, to which it now appears we were a proposed party? Who authorized the President of the United States, however much he may regard himself as the impersonation of the Government, to withhold information upon a subject concerning which he was presumably making a complete communication to Congress? On what theory did he regard himself as authorized to argue, and not in duty bound to state, the case just as it was?

Such a course may be justified elsewhere, but we are of the view that it will not be long tolerated in this country. Humiliating, indeed, must be the reading of these two statements, not alone to those who are friendly, but to those who are opposed to Mr. Roosevelt. The reading is alarming, too, as an indication of many things attempted to be pointed out in this article.

When some advocate shall make it appear that these two conflicting statements can be reconciled and that Mr. Roosevelt dealt in entire candor with Congress, he will earn the lasting gratitude of the American people. As the case now stands, however, it does not seem likely that any such fee can come out of this miserable mess.

There is an attempted defence of this Panama affair by Mr. Roosevelt and his supporters. That of Mr. Roosevelt is, perhaps, the best. He says in his letter of acceptance:

"Our opponents can criticise what we did in Panama only on condition of misstating what was done. The Administration behaved throughout not only with good faith, but with extraordinary patience and large generosity toward those with whom it dealt. It was also mindful of American interests. It acted in strict compliance with the

law passed by Congress. Had not Panama been promptly recognized, and the transit across the Isthmus kept open, in accordance with our treaty rights and obligations, there would have ensued endless guerilla warfare and possibly foreign complications; while all chance of building the canal would have been deferred, certainly for years, perhaps for a generation or more."

We are entitled to dismiss the statement that the Administration behaved throughout with extraordinary patience and large generosity toward those with whom it dealt, with the simple comment that the patience was of a wholly novel sort, true patience bearing to it about the same relation that sense bears to nonsense; and that the generosity seems to have been generosity only to stockholders in a canal company which was insolvent, and toward insurgents who were successful, if not through our alliance, at least by our connivance. That the Administration was not mindful of American interests is clear, for those interests could not best be subserved by the commission of a breach of national faith. Of course, it did not act in strict compliance with the law passed by Congress, because that law is mandatory in requiring the President to enter upon negotiations for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal if the Panama route could not be secured within a reasonable time—by treaty, be it remembered, and not by profit-sharing in a rebellion.

The fact that Mr. Roosevelt ignores this mandate and pleads that, by any course other than that adopted by him, the building of the canal would have been indefinitely deferred indicates the extremity to which he is obliged to resort in an attempt to justify his course.

The conjecture that guerilla warfare and possibly foreign complications would have ensued, but for the recognition of this one-day-old republic, is without justification. In fact, the more that light is let in upon this despicable affair—and light is being let in altogether too rapidly for the Republican peace of mind, one might conclude—the more the presumption grows into a conviction that Colombia, if not overawed by us, the Guarantor of her Sovereignty over Panama, would forthwith have suppressed that petty plot called, only by courtesy, a rebellion.

If we are going to conjecture as to what things might have happened if we had failed to act as we did, with how much more propriety may we not conjecture what another President may do, acting from purely evil motives—which we must all be prepared to

concede did not control Mr. Roosevelt—if this precedent be approved by a vote of the American people!

The fact is that the whole defence for Mr. Roosevelt of the Panama Canal episode falls to the ground. It is claimed by his supporters that, by our Treaty with New Granada, we were bound to do, or at least were justified in doing, what we did.

The claim cannot be sustained. The Treaty imposed reciprocal obligations upon the two contracting parties.

On the one hand, New Granada guaranteed to the United States the right to enjoy the ports of New Granada as they were enjoyed by her citizens; and, also,

"that right of way or transit across the Isthmus of Panama upon any modes of communication that now exist or that may hereafter be constructed, shall be open and free to the government and citizens of the United States; and for transportation of any articles of produce, manufacture or merchandise of lawful commerce belonging to the citizens of the United States, upon the same terms as to the citizens of New Granada."

On the other hand,

"The United States guarantee positively and efficaciously to New Granada by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the beforementioned Isthmus, with the view that free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this Treaty exists; and in consequence the United States also guarantee, in the same manner, the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory."

To the rights and obligations of New Granada, the United States of Colombia, and subsequently the Republic of Colombia, succeeded. The regularity of this succession and the sovereignty of the two republics were officially recognized by us in our diplomatic relations with them; two or more treaties were made and ratified between us and the United States of Colombia, and at least one was made and ratified between us and the Republic of Colombia, prior to the ill-fated Hay-Herran treaty. By a recognition of the new Republic of Panama and by forbidding the recovery by Colombia of the territory in revolt that we by treaty were bound to aid and not to obstruct, we prevented Colombia from fulfilling her guaranty to us. Then, by a claim that Colombia had not kept her part of the bargain, made impossible by our conduct, we repudiated our part of the treaty, which was to uphold the sovereignty of Colombia. We not only did all this, but,

by the precipitate recognition of the so-called Republic of Panama, we pursued a course which, if it had been adopted by foreign governments toward us in the time of the Civil War, might have made unsuccessful our effort to preserve the Union.

Mr. Root, in his defence of the Panama Canal incident, speaks of "the seizure by Panama of the opportunity to renew her oft-repeated effort to throw off the hateful and oppressive yoke of Colombia." But who set us up as judges to determine that the yoke of Colombia was hateful and oppressive? We recognized her sovereignty over Panama, and, however hateful and oppressive the yoke may have been, there can be no fair question that we should not have been guilty of a precipitate recognition of Panama but for the fact that we had in prospect the construction of the Canal. The question, however, cannot be discussed from any academic standpoint. We were under agreement not to do as we did, for the reason that we had undertaken by solemn treaty to guarantee the sovereignty of Colombia over Panama.

The following is the account of our stewardship as a Guarantor of Sovereignty. On the third of November, 1903, occurred the "uprising with no bloodshed" consisting of the arrest of two Colombian officers. Four days thereafter, we in the interval, and as matter of fact, before the uprising, having forbidden the movement of Colombian troops across the isthmus or any other hostile action by Colombia, three persons—"the dauntless Three" perhaps, who were about as much entitled to speak for a real republic as the three tailors of Tooley Street were entitled to petition Parliament as "We the people of England"—communicated by cable to the United States that the new Republic of Panama had been born. Recognition by us of the Republic took place on the day following, by this announcement, "The people of Panama, by an apparently unanimous movement, dissolved their political connection with the Republic of Colombia, and resumed their independence, and having adopted a Government of their own, republican in form, with which the Government of the United States has entered into relations, the President of the United States, in accordance with the ties of friendship which have so long and so happily existed between the respective nations, most earnestly commends to the Governments of Colombia and of Panama the peaceful and equitable settlement of all questions at issue between them. He holds that he is bound, not merely by

treaty obligations, but by the interests of civilization, to see that the peaceful traffic of the world across the Isthmus of Panama shall not longer be disturbed by a constant succession of unnecessary and wasteful civil wars."

The farce was thus complete.

"Do our opponents," flippantly asks Mr. Roosevelt in his letter of acceptance, "grudge the fifty millions paid for the Panama Canal?" No, perhaps not, but they do begrudge the stain which it has put upon our national honor, and they believe that in this they speak, not for the Democratic Party, but for the American People.

We are told by Mr. Hay, in his panegyric on Mr. Roosevelt, that "in times of doubt and difficulty the thought oftenest in his heart is 'What in such a case would Lincoln have done?'" The source of the trouble then must be that few cases of doubt and difficulty ever present themselves to Mr. Roosevelt when bent upon the accomplishment of his purpose, inasmuch as evidence of any such heart referendum is so rarely apparent in his political life.

Clearly, in the spoliation of Colombia there seems to have been no "doubt or difficulty"; nor, to complete the alliteration, was there any delay.

What a travesty it all is! To intimate even that Lincoln, with his infinite charity and forbearance, and with his deep religious devotion to principle and his subordination of self, would, under like conditions, not only without the authority, but against the mandate of a statute and of the Constitution, have done what Mr. Roosevelt did to Colombia, and in other ways would have made history as Mr. Roosevelt has made history, comes perilously near being a libel upon our martyred dead.

In a noted case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the question at issue was the right of maintenance of an action of ejectment against property held for the account of the United States. In the course of the argument, one of the Justices of the Court, in order to emphasize his intimation that such an action should not be maintained, asked of the counsel what his view would be where a plaintiff should be successful in a similar action instituted to recover Government land used for a lighthouse, which would thereby be dismantled.

The answer of the counsel was:

"Better that the lighthouse never should be lighted than that the Light of the Law should be extinguished."

On the eve of the great battle of Plassey, which was to determine the question of the possession of India by the English nation, Omichund, an ally, was about to play the British false. He was bribed by Lord Clive to remain true, and the understanding was to be set down in a treaty which Omichund supposed to have been signed by representatives of the English nation. The paper delivered to him was a substituted paper, and even that paper did not bear the signature it purported to bear. The biographer of Clive sought to defend it. Concerning the defence, Macaulay says:

"We should not think it necessary to offer any remarks for the purpose of directing the judgment of our readers with respect to this transaction, had not Sir John Malcolm undertaken to defend it in all its parts. He regrets, indeed, that it was necessary to employ means so liable to abuse as forgery; but he will not admit that any blame attaches to those who deceived the deceiver. He thinks that the English were not bound to keep faith with one who kept no faith with them, and that, if they had fulfilled their engagements with the wily Bengalee, so signal an example of successful treason would have produced a crowd of imitators. Now, we will not discuss this point on any rigid principles of morality. Indeed it is quite unnecessary to do so. For, looking at the question as a question of expediency in the lowest sense of the word, and using no arguments but such as Machiavelli might have employed in his conferences with Borgia, we are convinced that Clive was altogether in the wrong, and that he committed, not merely a crime, but a blunder. That honesty is the best policy is a maxim which we firmly believe to be generally correct, even with respect to the temporal interest of individuals; but with respect to societies, the rule is subject to still fewer exceptions, and that for this reason, that the life of societies is longer than the life of individuals. It is possible to mention men who have owed great worldly prosperity to breaches of private faith; but we doubt whether it be possible to mention a state which has, on the whole, been a gainer by a breach of public faith."

The Republic of Colombia had failed, it is asserted, to act in a spirit of fairness toward our Government. Though there is no complete proof of this, suppose it be conceded. Still, Colombia owed us no obligation to accept the treaty we proposed, fair though it may have been. Omichund, owing the English nation the obligations of an ally, was treacherous on the eve of battle; yet treachery to him has been condemned. If Macaulay be right—and who will have the hardihood to say that he is wrong?—how much less justification was there for our action toward Colombia, even

though that weaker nation was contumacious and was not acting as we thought would best enable us to promote the construction of a means of communication perhaps needed by us and by the whole world?

It is said by the Psalmist that he shall dwell in the tabernacle of the Lord and shall rest upon His holy hill and shall never fall, who among other things "hath not done evil to his neighbor, and hath not slandered his neighbor; and that sweareth unto his neighbor and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance." And whether we like to recognize it or not, we have come short of the standard of the Psalmist, for we profited by, even if we did not promote, a rebellion by which Colombia was stripped of her possessions; we set up an unworthy attack upon that nation as a justification and defence for the course we had pursued; and, more than all, we broke a solemn treaty obligation, for our commercial advantage.

To the extent that this wrong can be righted, reparation should, after full investigation, be made to the Republic of Colombia freely and promptly, if only for the reason, selfish though it be—though there are other reasons—that the act shall not serve as an accepted precedent, and that one stain upon the page of our history may be blotted out forever.

The danger in all such acts is not alone in themselves. Unless such an act be condemned, then, under the rule of law to which we have referred, it becomes a precedent for future misconduct, and whether it be right or wrong it may bind us as a people to the extent that rights have vested and rules of property and of conduct have become established under it; and it is to be remembered as a warning that it is rarely in great situations like these that such rights do not vest, and such rules do not become established.

Great danger, too, lurks in the condonation of such an act, for it is an accepted law of ethics that punishment in the Court of Conscience, unlike that in Courts of Law, lessens with each repeated and unrebuked offence; and it should be a matter of grave concern, that we do not deaden our sensibilities as a people to that which makes for righteous national conduct.

The whole Panama incident is defensible only as an act of expediency, and that defence is always demurrable when the charge is of a violation of the honor and the good faith of a State.

It is not a bright page in American history and never can be.

No doubt, it was desirable to secure an interocean waterway, but it would have been better that vessels should round the Cape until the end of time than that we, for any purpose, should have shortened the route by the practices with which we stand charged.

When Grover Cleveland, as Governor of the State of New York, was called upon to consider a bill passed by the Legislature reducing the fares on the Elevated Railroad, he vetoed a popular measure because his courage and adherence to principle, of which this action was but one of many manifestations, forbade him to accept expediency as his guide. He said:

"But we have specially in our keeping the honor and good faith of a great State, and we should see to it that no suspicion attaches, through any act of ours, to the fair fame of the commonwealth. The State should not only be strictly just but scrupulously fair, and in its relations to the citizens every legal and moral obligation should be recognized. . . .

"The experiences of other States teach us that we must keep within the limits of law and good faith, lest in the end we bring upon the very people whom we seek to benefit and protect a hardship which must surely follow when these limits are ignored."

As we have attempted to point out, the other acts of the Republican Party referred to, though differing in degree, are of common origin with those discussed, and are all manifestations of a determination on the part of the Republican Party to go forward with its purposes, if deemed expedient, regardless of means or of precedents laid down for our guidance, to be as mindful of the business of other people as we are of our own; to rule and not to serve the people.

It remains only to add this commentary as to the policy and conduct of that party.

The Democratic Party stands opposed to these acts. It insists that our national faith shall be kept at all times. It insists that the tariff shall be reconstructed so that injustice to the many shall not continue to be committed for the benefit of the few, and that an artificial income, abnormally large, shall not afford the basis or the incitement for profligate expenditures. It insists that we shall have a Government of peace as well as prosperity. It insists that, as we grow great and powerful, we shall be considerate to all nations. It insists that States are safe only so long as principles hold sway, even though conduct may at times fall short of the ideals which these principles enjoin; and it insists that we shall not, by our indifference, or by our approval of or acquiescence in

wrong acts, permit to be set up in this country false gods for worship.

If this be insincerity, then, clearly, insincerity is synonymous with love of country.

The Democratic Party insists that we have been burdened by the fortunes of war with the execution of a great trust in the Philippines, and not with the continued possession of a great territory—made possible only by a formidable navy, which it is now proposed to expand indefinitely—and it insists that to discharge that trust and hand back these lands to its inhabitants, free and independent, under conditions that will insure to us always a dominating moral and commercial influence there, involves no such nonsense as hauling down the flag of our country in dishonor; but it insists that, when that day of rejoicing shall have come to the Philippines, our flag for the first time will be raised there in triumph. It insists that for us, in the promotion of any world-wide scheme or policy, to hold possession of this territory for one moment beyond the time when its citizens are entitled to receive it, would be no more justifiable than would be the action of a trustee who might appropriate funds of which he was not the beneficiary, but the mere temporary custodian.

It insists that the duty of doing prompt and full justice to the people of the Philippines can be more safely entrusted to the Democratic Party, which regards our occupation of that territory as a misfortune, rather than to the Republican Party, which asserts that we are entitled to claim over it a rightful ownership.

Nor, in insisting that we shall thus limit our possession of territory, is the Democratic Party called upon to repudiate the doctrine of its founder, and to call in question the wisdom of the Louisiana Purchase; for Jefferson, in his correspondence with Madison, maintained that nothing should ever be accepted by us in the way of additional territory which would require a navy for its defence.

That the Democratic Party in all this is sincere, no one can doubt who hears a recitation of what it stands for, and what it stands opposed to, in this campaign. The kind of candidate it has selected is good evidence of its sincerity.

He stands for sound learning, and was a trained lawyer before he became the accomplished and honored presiding Judge of the Court of Appeals; he has lived true to the ideals and traditions of that court. He is a safe Judge and a safe man. There is no one

who has yet had the effrontery to say that anything but high motives have governed his judicial utterances. He stands as a man for all that makes manhood worth while, for a simple and rugged straightforwardness, for plain living and right thinking. He may not devote much time to exhibitions of the arts of rhetoric or to high-sounding phrases, but it may be that we have been fed in this country so much on highly seasoned, spectacular stuff, that we are no longer satisfied with the homely fare of simple, old-fashioned, forcible statement. If Judge Parker is not strenuous, he is at least of that dignity which will consort well with the administration of the high office for which he is a candidate; and if he does not go about armed to the teeth, we can yet claim that he is "rich in saving common sense."

Great problems are in process of being worked out in this country. At one extreme stands the Republican Party with its erroneous conception of government, that supreme power rests and is to be augmented in the National Government, asserting by its acts that the means are not to be so much regarded as the end; that power shall be exerted arbitrarily and without warrant of law or of the Constitution, provided only it work out to our commercial and financial benefit. Allied with the Republican Party, concededly, are vast, concentrated and powerful commercial and financial interests—not in themselves necessarily of injury to society, but believed by many to contain the source of great possible future peril.

At the other extreme are the dangerous forces which are bred and nourished in unrest and discontent, and whose emancipation from error only education, coupled with right example, can effect. If the record of the Republican Party for the past few years be now endorsed, and if the protest now urged against a course of political conduct which has been opposed to law and constitutional restraint be disregarded, will not an ominous object lesson have been presented to those representing this unrest and discontent, and may not they conclude that there is no good reason why they, too, should not seize the opportunity when it seems to them ripe and use any means which will accomplish what they regard as a justifiable end, though we know that end to be disaster?

We have boundless territory and great prosperity,—and national prosperity, it must be admitted, is essential to the accomplishment of the greatest good,—but to attain this prosperity we

cannot afford to see weakened the foundations upon which our security rests. Already on the subject of slavery this country has been torn asunder by a war in which great blood and treasure were poured out for the maintenance of the Union itself. That our country will survive in all its undiminished vigor, with increasing power for usefulness, should be the conviction of every citizen. But this conviction will become only a hope, and perhaps not even a reasonable hope at that, if we deliberately incur the new perils which a lack of reverence for the Constitution is bound to create.

If, however, on the other hand, when doubts arise as to our duty as a people, we have ever present in our thoughts the conditions under which republican government here was begun, and have regard for whatsoever things are elevated and uplifting, rejecting utterly as a people the doctrine that expediency furnishes a satisfactory rule for conduct; if we live true to the standards set up for our guidance by the founders of the Republic, and keep untiring watch over their legacy to us, permitting no man and no party, whether from good or from evil motives, to filch one farthing of that treasure from us, then this Government must go forward to fresh triumphs, not alone in material advancement, but in all that makes for true greatness and for lasting renown.

Emerson says, as he prophesies of the future of the Republic, "The spread eagle must fold his foolish wings, and be less of a peacock." And then he adds:

"In this country, with our practical understanding, there is, at present, a great sensualism, a headlong devotion to trade, to trade and to the conquest of continent—to each man as large a share of the same as he can carve for himself—an extravagant confidence in our talent and activity, which becomes, whilst successful, a scornful materialism, but with the fault, of course, that it has no depth, no reserved force to fall back upon when a reverse comes."

Matthew Arnold, too, has given us this out of the rich storehouse of his intelligence:

"And the philosophers and the prophets, whom I at any rate am disposed to believe, and who say that moral causes govern the standing and the falling of States, will tell us that the failure to mind whatsoever things are elevated must impair with an inexorable fatality the life of a nation, just as the failure to mind whatsoever things are just, or whatsoever things are pure, will impair it; and that if the failure to mind whatsoever things are elevated should be real in your American democracy, and should grow into a disease, and take firm hold on you,

then the life of even these great United States must inevitably suffer and be impaired more and more, until it perish."

Horace, in one of his great Odes, summed up, for us as well as for the Roman People, the philosophy of conduct for a nation, when he charged them with having left so long unvisited and neglected the altars of the gods:

> **"Dis te minorem quod geris, imperas;**
> **Hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum."**

All this may be scoffed at as preaching the counsels of perfection; but, if space permitted, such preaching could be abundantly reinforced by many quotations not alone from the writings of other authors, but from the writings of Mr. Roosevelt himself, who in stirring, eloquent words has taught and advocated much which he has discarded in his public life.

And when such preaching and the practices it enjoins shall be departed from by those holding high places of political trust among us, and the departure be not condemned, and when this preaching and these practices shall cease to furnish us with our rule for national conduct, we shall show as little solicitude for the best interests of the Republic as we should for our personal safety, if, in embarking on a ship for a long voyage, we threw overboard chart and compass as we dropped the pilot.

JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: ROME: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *October, 1904.*

MR. BALFOUR has forgotten his Walpole. That supreme embodiment of political common sense advised his young men not to use the word "Never." Mr. Balfour has not only used the word but underlined and repeated it, and the chances greatly are that the issue of the event will confound his imprudence. Speaking at Edinburgh on October 3rd, the Prime Minister said:

"I am given to understand that the leader of the Irish party, of the Home Rule party, is giving wide currency in America to the view that the Irish party in the House of Commons is, after the next election, going to hold the balance between the two great historical parties into which we of the United Kingdom have been divided, and that by holding that balance he can exact from one or other of the contending factions the terms which may suit him and his friends. So far as I am concerned, so far as my colleagues are concerned, so far as the party with which I am connected is concerned, no such bargaining can, or ever will, take place. They may make what propositions they like, they may make what terms they choose with our political opponents; we, gentlemen, are not for sale."

Emphatic words, and received, I need hardly add, with rapturous cheers by the audience, and with hardly less satisfaction by the stalwarts of Ulster. But are they to be taken at their face value? If the Irish Nationalists, as they are extremely likely to be, are again in a position to hold the balance of power between Liberals and Conservatives, if neither party can take office without the support of Irish votes, is it "practical politics" to suppose that the Conservatives will for all time abandon power and consent to forego the prosecution of their cherished Protectionist policies, rather than come to terms with Mr. Redmond and his followers? I do not believe it is. Still less do I believe it when one of the leaders is a man like Mr. Chamberlain, who is tempera-

mentally incapable of allowing anything to stand between himself and whatever goal happens to be his immediate objective. The real importance of Mr. Balfour's declaration consists, not in its bearing on possible developments in the future but in its relation to the actual and immediate present. It is a sign that the Irish question is coming, even if it has not already come, once more to the forefront of English politics.

By the Irish question I do not mean the Home Rule question, or at any rate not the Gladstonian form of it. I think it may almost be taken as axiomatic that no party will again attempt to settle the Irish problem at a single comprehensive stroke. If Mr. Redmond expects that, he will assuredly be disappointed. The feeling of England has, with virtual unanimity, accepted it as one of the necessities of the case that what is compendiously known as "the Irish question" must henceforth be dealt with in piecemeal fashion, by gradual approaches along the line of practical utility, and by taking, as the phrase is, one point at a time. It is recognized by every one who is neither an Orangeman nor a leader-writer on "The Times" that in the last eighteen years the problem of Irish government has changed in many, if not most, of its essentials. I can but briefly enumerate some of the factors that have contributed to the change. In the first place, there has been the gift of local government. Through their county and district councils the Irish possess to-day as large a measure of domestic autonomy in purely local matters as the English or the Scotch. The experiment of Irish self-government has immensely justified itself, the people are at last and for the first time receiving a thorough training in administrative work, and with one or two exceptions, the Irish county councils are at least as efficient as the English county councils. The wretched and stupid taunt that the Irish are "unfit" for self-government will scarcely, I imagine, be heard again.

And, secondly, there is the Land Purchase Act of 1903. That Act, of course, has not settled the Land Question. But there can be little doubt that, on the whole, the results of the Act have so far fulfilled all reasonable expectations. The foundations of a new social order of peasant proprietors are being swiftly and securely laid, and that fact alone marks the downfall of a vicious and indefensible system that poisoned the whole social and economic life of Ireland. Thirdly, there has been that wonderful movement of

self-help and agricultural cooperation instituted by Sir Horace Plunkett—a movement which, though working outside of politics, has done more, with the help of the Gaelic League, to revivify the true Ireland, to brace the Irish character and to inculcate thrift, responsibility and business-like habits among the peasants, than all the legislative enactments of the past twenty-five years. These measures and achievements, it is worth noting, together with the development of light railroads and the State-aided migration of the people from uneconomic to economic holdings, are all the work either of individual Unionists or of the Unionist Government. Unionism, in short, has ceased to be a merely passive policy of resistance and repression, and has broadened out into a mellower and more tolerant creed and, above all, into a programme of constructive amelioration. At the same time, Ireland is beginning to feel the stirrings of a really national spirit, and to evolve a new sense of the interdependence of all sections, creeds, interests and parties. The attitude of England towards Ireland has also vastly improved. There is not, so far as I can see, the least sign of a reaction in favor of Home Rule, nor are the two peoples even now within measurable distance of understanding one another. But English opinion on Irish problems and Irish demands is, if not repentant, at least free from bitterness; there is an obviously anxious desire to "do the right thing," a willingness to listen and to learn, a friendly effort to be tactful. It is a further sign of the times that the men of Ulster are as little well-disposed towards the present Unionist Government as the Nationalists themselves; they complain of being "betrayed," and they have more than once of late voted against the Ministry. It is yet more significant that Sir Antony MacDonnell, the permanent Under-Secretary of State for Ireland and the mainspring of the Irish administrative machine, is a Roman Catholic and an avowed Home-Ruler.

How far we have travelled from the days of 1886 may be judged by the programme of the newly born Irish Reform Association. This Association was founded at the end of last August by Lord Dunraven and a small body of Unionist landlords. They are the same men who in 1902 arranged that conference between landlords, tenants and politicians that afterwards bore such magnificent fruit in the Land Purchase Act. To say that they are "self-constituted" and that they "represent nobody but themselves" is technically true. But the opinions and the proposals of men who

gave the initial propulsion to one of the greatest pieces of Irish legislation that have ever been enacted can hardly be dismissed as irresponsible. Personally, I am inclined to attach the greatest importance to them, not so much for their immediate and intrinsic practicality—on that it is too early to pass judgment—as for what they portend in the future and for the spirit and tendencies that animate them. Remember that these gentlemen are Unionists, and that they expressly reiterate their belief in the maintenance of the union between Great Britain and Ireland. In spite of this, they have put forward a unanimous report advocating the establishment of an Irish Financial Council, consisting of twelve nominated and twelve elected members, to control all purely Irish expenditure, and the setting up in Dublin of a statutory body to deal with the whole range of private Bill legislation for Ireland. That, to be sure, is not Home Rule or anything like it; but it is a long step towards devolution, and, coming as it does from convinced Unionists, I do not see how its significance can be overestimated. "The Times," at any rate, was sufficiently awake to its seriousness to attack it with all the fury of the old Parnell days; and Mr. Wyndham, the Irish Secretary, felt obliged to declare, "without reserve or qualification, that the Unionist Government is opposed to the multiplication of legislative bodies within the United Kingdom, whether in pursuance of the policy generally known as 'Home Rule for Ireland,' or in pursuance of the policy generally known as 'Home Rule all round.'" That, perhaps, was only to be expected; nor can Lord Dunraven and his friends have been much surprised to find their proposals denounced by most Unionists in Ireland, and accorded but a patronizing and lukewarm welcome by the Nationalists. Nevertheless, this tremendous fact remains, that a body of prominent and distinguished Unionists have gone on record as favoring the establishment of a subordinate legislature in Ireland for the management of purely Irish business. That fact, I feel confident, must ultimately come to be looked back upon as marking a turning-point in Irish history. It is the natural climax to the changes I have hurriedly sketched in Irish social and economic conditions, in the attitude of England towards Ireland and in the attitude of Ireland towards herself; and it coincides with the fast-ripening conviction on the part of Englishmen that the House of Commons is now physically incapable of handling properly the intolerable amount of business

it is called upon to deal with, that it has already degenerated into little more than an assembly for registering the decrees of the Government, and that it must, if it wishes to preserve its old efficiency, at any cost get rid of the masses of local business that encumber and clog its workings. Home Rule, let me again repeat, is not yet in sight; but a series of reforms that will check the utter wastefulness of the Dublin Castle system and give Ireland at least as much control over her private Bills as Scotland possesses, is something that the very near future may easily see.

The mystery of Mr. Balfour's opinions on Fiscal Reform and of his relations with Mr. Chamberlain grows deeper with every speech he makes. Mr. Balfour's policy is Retaliation. He wishes to recover for England her lost, or rather her obsolete, power of negotiating commercial treaties with foreign Governments on something like an equitable basis. At present, Great Britain, having agreed to forego the persuasive deterrent of a tariff duty, finds herself, when it comes to a matter of international bargaining, at a serious commercial and political disadvantage. This disadvantage Mr. Balfour hopes to wipe out by his policy of Retaliation. He asks for the authorization of the electorate to approach, let us say, Germany with this proposal: "Unless you agree to reduce your duties on articles A, B and C, we shall at once clap on a duty on articles D, E and F." Mr. Balfour evidently believes that the threat alone will be sufficient, and that the overwhelming importance which the Continent attaches to free access to the British market will, in itself, be enough to carry his point. What is to happen if the foreigner declines to come to terms, whether the duty will be imposed, and if it is, for how long and to what extent, is not very clear. Mr. Gladstone's experience between 1841 and 1844, "when the state of our tariff was such as to supply us with plenty of material for liberal offers," and when "we were anxiously and eagerly endeavoring to make tariff treaties with many foreign countries," was that failure attended every effort, and that it was doubtful "whether we advanced the cause of Free Trade by a single inch." Nor are the present-day Free-Traders without good warrant in believing that the policy of Retaliation, while honestly aiming at securing freer trade, will really end in the establishment of a Protective Tariff. However that may be, Mr. Balfour has taken his stand on Retaliation and, he has hitherto declined to advocate a policy which could only rest on the basis of a food-

tax. The situation has been immensely complicated by the fact that it is Mr. Chamberlain's programme, and not Mr. Balfour's, that is favored by the majority of the Unionist party, that Retaliation has been practically swamped by the bolder policy of Protection and Colonial Preference, and that Mr. Balfour, in order to keep his majority intact, has been forced to steer a wavering course between those who claim him as a Chamberlainite and those who insist that he is still a Free-Trader at heart. The nation has been bewildered in its attempt to decide whether, if it came to a pinch, Mr. Balfour would merge his policy in the Chamberlain programme, or would stand to his Retaliatory guns.

In his Edinburgh speech of October 3rd, Mr. Balfour made an apparently sincere attempt to resolve these doubts. The occasion was one of great tactical moment. The National Union of Conservative Associations will have held its annual meeting by the time this letter appears in print. At its last annual meeting, only Mr. Balfour's threat of resignation prevented the Caucus from declaring for the Chamberlain programme. What would happen at the approaching meeting? Would the delegates insist on giving a formal expression to their Chamberlainite convictions, and so repudiate the Prime Minister and still further widen the gap in the party? Mr. Balfour had to act with all the greater haste inasmuch as Mr. Chamberlain was engaged to speak on October 5th at Luton in Bedfordshire, and was then leaving the country for six weeks. In view of the meeting of the Conservative Associations an understanding between the two men and a public token of their entire agreement were imperative. Mr. Balfour, accordingly, hurriedly arranged to be entertained at dinner by the Scottish Conservative Club two days before Mr. Chamberlain was due to speak. In the course of his speech, the Prime Minister made two important announcements. He declared himself with unusual emphasis against the policy of Protection—"the policy," as he called it, "of supporting or creating home industries by raising home prices." He had never recommended that policy, directly or indirectly; he did not believe it to be an expedient policy under the existing circumstances of the country; and, though he would remain a supporter of the Conservative party, if it adopted Protection as part of its programme, he could not remain its leader. His second announcement bore on the issue of Colonial Preference. "It surely is wrong," he said, and here every Englishman agrees

with him, "that we should now be using, voluntarily or involuntarily, those Imperial sentiments as they exist in our great self-governing Colonies as counters in a political game, and that from one platform and another in this country we should be throwing charges that the Colonies want this, that the Colonies do not want it, that the Colonies are earnestly desirous of a closer union, fiscal and otherwise, with this country, or, again, that the Colonies have no such desire and no such wish, that their one aim is to be left alone." To rescue the Empire from the political cockpit, Mr. Balfour declared that, if returned to power after the next election, he would summon a conference of representatives from the Colonies and India; that the delegates to this conference should be absolutely uncommitted by any special views or instructions; that they should freely discuss whether "this ideal of fiscal union" was commendable, and, if so, how it could be carried out; and that whatever plan they finally agreed upon should be submitted to the electorates as well as the Parliaments of the Mother Country and the Colonies for their acceptance or rejection. All this, as Mr. Balfour said, would take time. It certainly would. Indeed, it would take so much time, and its issue would be so delightfully uncertain, that Mr. Balfour's proposal might well be regarded as an attempt to shelve the whole matter indefinitely.

Two days later, on October 5th, Mr. Chamberlain spoke, and there was the keenest interest to see how he would receive Mr. Balfour's manifesto. The Protectionist journals had handled it with singular unanimity. They all agreed that Mr. Balfour's opposition to Protection meant nothing and was no more than "an innocent device"; and they all agreed in welcoming his proposed Colonial Conference as an immense step in the direction of Mr. Chamberlain's views. Mr. Chamberlain himself may have inspired these utterances; at any rate, in his Luton speech he adopted and repeated them. He stated that, like Mr. Balfour, he was entirely opposed to the Protection of fifty years ago—quite ignoring the fact that Mr. Balfour declared himself opposed to any Protection, to Protection in principle, to Protection as a policy. He went on to congratulate himself on Mr. Balfour's conversion to the idea of Colonial Preferences, and found "only one blemish" in his plan—namely, that it would require two General Elections to carry it out. This seems an unimportant shortcoming, but it is really vital. If Mr. Chamberlain can induce Mr. Balfour to con-

tent himself with one election, then he has the entire Unionist party squarely and officially committed to the policy of Protection and Colonial Preference. The "Westminster Gazette" has summed up the situation with its usual clarity:

"Mr. Balfour desires, if the Unionist party is returned to power at the next election, to have a Conference at which nobody will be committed to anything and everybody free to discuss everything. After that, if the Conference recommends food taxes, there is to be a General Election before that proposal is carried into effect. We believe the idea of the uncommitted Conference to be impracticable, but that is not the point. The point is that Mr. Balfour intends by this device to keep the Unionist party free from the proposal to tax food at the next election. Mr. Chamberlain, on the contrary, by substituting one election for two, would make that proposal *the* issue at the next election, and compel the Unionist party to ask here and now for a mandate which would enable it to tax food in the next Parliament. The difference is vital, and if Mr. Balfour concedes the point he concedes everything."

Such is the stage we have so far reached in this subterranean struggle, if struggle it be, between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain. There are moments when the issue of Free Trade or Protection is overshadowed by the intentness of the nation upon the fluctuating relations of these two Unionist leaders. Are they really opposed to one another, or are they playing into one another's hands with the help of a private code? It is over a year since that question was first propounded, and even to-day it would be easy to collect at least half a dozen irreconcilable and equally emphatic answers to it. The meeting of the Conservative Associations at the end of October may throw some light on the problem, but I scarcely expect it. Indeed, the net result of the recent speech-making is to convince the Free-Traders and Protectionists in the Unionist party that each is right. The Unionist Free-Traders, with the important exception of "The Spectator," were never more sure than they are at this moment that Mr. Balfour is really with them in their opposition to Protection and Colonial Preference. The Chamberlainites have never before claimed Mr. Balfour so publicly as their friend and ally. The country, meanwhile, suspecting chicanery somewhere, and being unable to say precisely where, is palpably tiring of both Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain, and has quite made up its mind to vote for neither.

BERLIN, *October, 1904.*

As the war cloud in the Far East gathers in intensity—so that the end seems more obscure and more remote than ever—European politics tend to become clear. Not that international politics are one whit less complex now than they were at any time since last February, but rather that the general feeling of uncertainty, sapping initiative, which prevailed in European Chancelleries in the opening months of hostilities, has given way to a more comprehensive grasp of the situation; while things, as so often happens, have partly righted themselves with time—which is perhaps the best adjuster of all. And already the war has had positive results. It has accentuated the bond of interest, where present, between nations: attenuated the artificial. European statesmen have had time, and have begun, to recover from the paralyzing shock caused by the outbreak of war, and in the subterranean runnels of diplomacy renewed activity is noticeable. The struggle for political supremacy in the East has exercised its inevitable effect upon the Powers of the West, who have been constrained to show their hands. Governments and peoples are thus in a state of political transition, in still rather tentative form, it may be, but, none the less, diverging or converging in unmistakable manner, and along unmistakable lines. Looking at Europe to-day, we find that the war, on the one hand, has brought about a marked political *rapprochement* between the Governments of Germany and Russia, and, on the other, has imparted a fresh stimulus to the popularity of a common-sense understanding between the peoples of England and France. Nor is there anything to cause surprise in this. It is, surely, natural enough that, in a war between an Asiatic people saturated in Western civilization and a Western state steeped in Asiatic tradition, the free peoples of two such free countries as England and France should find common cause for agreement, while the two foremost living exemplars of military despotism should see in the victorious issue of Russian arms in the East a fitting reason for mutual rejoicing. What more natural than that the "Admiral of the West" should stand by the "Admiral of the East" in the hour of need? For, though Germans individually and collectively are pronouncedly pro-Japanese, yet their voices are no more able to make themselves felt in the direction of their country's affairs than the groans of the stricken, the needy

and oppressed within the realms of "All the Russias" can touch the heart of the "Little Father." Thus insensibly the old grouping of the Powers in Europe has become modified. Europe seems to be falling almost insensibly into two perfectly natural halves: the West as opposed to the East, the free peoples of Democracy and Progress as against the mailed forces of Autocracy and Reaction. And Germany, as the centre Power, is the central influence for good or for evil.

Now, since the day when Mr. Chamberlain glibly spoke of an Anglo-German Alliance and Count von Bülow informed him that no such political combination was contemplated by Germany, it has become increasingly evident to all students of European affairs that friendship with her "Eastern neighbor" was, as Bismarck always insisted it must be, the end and object of Germany's diplomacy. This is not the place to recapitulate the various reasons, historical, military, political, dynastic and even social, that in their "cumulative force" go far to justify Bismarckian policy towards Russia; nor is it germane to our subject to inquire into the general principles regulating the policies of the two great military monarchies of Northern Europe. In spite of jars and friction in the past, of modern Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism, both Germany and Russia have, ever since the foundation of Russian hegemony, felt in turn the need of one another, and no development in all international politics is more natural than the bond of interest and sympathy that now links the Governments of Germany and Russia together. Now, more than ever, the dynasties of Russia and Germany are maintained as living institutions chiefly by what is known in Central Europe as "the monarchical principle," which is based, humanly speaking, on the popular faith in the infallibility of the Sovereign, but actually rests on force and despotic military rule. The police régime of Russia exists also to a large extent, though in more modified form, in modern Germany; and, if Germany is the nursery of organized Socialism, Russia is regarded as the great barrier to "revolutionary ideas," which, in the eyes of the powerful privileged and aristocratic classes, range over the whole gamut of what is generally understood by modern reform. And as personal government in Germany, owing to the difference in the personalities of the respective Sovereigns, has reached a point far exceeding the commonly supposed omnipotent rule of the Tsar, it is quite in

harmony with the existing order of things to find the country that gave birth to Goethe and Kant in sympathetic communion in the twentieth century with the spirit reflected in the system of a man such as Plehve. The dead palsy of public opinion in Germany and Russia finds its natural counterpoise in militarism and absolute control by the Sovereign; and the present *rapprochement* between those two countries is as much the personal work, in his own interests, of the German Emperor, as the outcome of a fortuitous, and for Germany unexpectedly fortunate, combination of circumstances in the higher interests of German "*Weltpolitik.*" This *rapprochement* is the great feature in international politics at the moment, and with this feature all European statesmen will in the future have to reckon. For the most egotistic, self-interested and, therefore, the most potential, Alliance in Europe to-day is unquestionably that, signed or unsigned, contracted between the Emperors of Russia and Germany. And the greater the embarrassments and trials of Russia, the greater her loss of prestige and power, the more necessary will the material and moral aid and support of Germany become to her, and the greater her debt of acknowledgment.

A great deal has been written and said during the past month about this understanding between Russia and Germany, mainly because "The Times" drew public attention to the matter by publishing a closely reasoned document to show how the understanding had been brought about, and to prove that a "secret agreement" actually existed. Though similar statements had not unfrequently been seen in print before, and people in close touch with German politics had long ago foreseen that an *entente* was inevitable, the appearance of that statement in the columns of "The Times," supported by a weighty introductory article, created a sensation on the Continent, and immediately led to an international press wrangle. Naturally, the German Government was somewhat annoyed at what it styled the "perfidious onslaughts of the London City organ"; and, naturally, too, the duty devolved upon the Press bureau of the German Foreign Office to assail "The Times," and issue denials. Both these things it did zealously. On September 15th the "*Koelnische Zeitung*" repudiated all idea of an understanding between Germany and Russia; and the Foreign Office organ, "The North-German Gazette," quickly followed with an equally crisp denial. The controversy,

however, continued, until "The Daily Graphic" one morning put an end to the pother for the time being by declaring that, in Russian official circles, no credence was attached to the statement. This announcement was circulated in Germany, and through Germany over a great portion of the Continent, as being of the highest political significance; and possibly it might have been if the version circulated had been the correct one. But, as a matter of fact, the German Continental version made the denial emanate, not from "Russian sources," but "from a quarter in close touch with the English Foreign Office"—which, of course, put a totally false complexion upon the value of the source, and made it look as if Lord Lansdowne felt personally affronted because "The Times" laid claim to exclusive information. Then there followed further denials, and Herr von Brandt, former German Ambassador at Pekin, expatiated, in the "*Vossische Zeitung*," upon the malignant nature of the press. The question whether a secret agreement has been concluded between the two Powers, or whether, indeed, anything in the shape of a verbal or written document exists between them, must be left to "The Times" to answer. It is difficult, even for the experienced eye, to draw any reliable conclusions from the tangle of semi-official statements—and misstatements—that appear in the "well-informed" organs of the German press on occasions of this kind; but there seems to be some ground for assuming that "The North-German Gazette" was technically correct when it pointed out, with unconscious humor, that the German Emperor and the Tsar, on the occasion of their last meeting, only referred to the Far-Eastern situation in the course of casual conversation during a game of billiards. What an "*aperçu*" that gives into the minds and ways of kings! That game of billiards stands out now historically in the dim light of the past, and we shall not forget it. It is a scene that Carlyle would have rejoiced in, and it might even yet be depicted upon canvas by the octogenarian Hohenzollern painter, Menzel. Moreover, it is, probably, perfectly true—strange though it may seem, when it is remembered that the two great autocrats of Europe met to confer together on the eve of so momentous a crisis, and that for that purpose their privacy was guarded by a veritable army of Russian and German police spies, soldiers, and constables. It might be instructive to press the Foreign Office organ further and elicit the information who won that game of billiards, but

our impression is that the Tsar won the billiards and the Emperor the other game. In any case, whether it was over the billiard-table, or elaborately done with ink on paper, both Tsar and Emperor "signed to that bond." From that day onward, the "benevolent neutrality" of Germany took form and substance, and both countries were freed from a long-standing cause of obsession. For the first time since the proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles, Russia was enabled to denude the whole of her Western frontier garrisons of troops, and even to dismantle some of the fortresses, in order to send siege-guns to the theatre of war; while Germany stood sentinel at the frontier, turning back deserters from the Russian army there, hunting up recruits here, vagrants* and emigrants, and delivering them all over to the mercies of the Russian police.

The sale of four valuable steamers, described in the "*Taschenbuch der Kriegsflotten*" for 1904 as "auxiliary cruisers" of the German Navy, was unquestionably an act of unusual benevolence on the part of a neutral power; nor has any serious denial been given to the reiterated statement of the German press that "parts" of torpedo-boats were being forwarded to Russia. Then the safe haven of Kiao-chao was made the objective for a rush for safety by the Russian Port Arthur fleet; and, as Prince Ukhtomsky has fallen into disgrace for not having obeyed orders and brought his ships in the wake of the "Tsarevitch" into that friendly but neutral port, great importance must have been attributed in Russia to the successful issue of the sortie. Indeed, the "benevolent neutrality" of Germany has been throughout of incalculable value to Russia, of far greater service to her than any benefit she may have derived from the formal Treaty of Alliance with France: who, with England, has been engaged in keeping the ring, leaving the task of holding the sponge to the Chancellery at Berlin. And concerning coal the same complaisance and benevolence are noticeable. Here, again, "The North-German Gazette" assumed white raiments of innocence, and protested that the coaling of foreign ships was a "private enterprise conducted by the contractors, and not inconsistent with the strict neutrality of a state." But that catholic principle did not prevent the Government from refusing permission to German firms

* *Vide* the account of the treatment meted out to Russian emigrants in Germany, recently published in the "*Vorwärts.*"

to supply the Boers with munitions; and, since M. Hutin published in the "*Echo de Paris*" a letter written by Herr Diedrichsen, of Kiel, brother of Rear-Admiral Diedrichsen, and Russian Consul to boot, offering to supply Admiral Rozhdestvensky with "any quantity" of coal, the German semi-official press has issued no further *démentis*. Nor has it seen fit to give any denial to the persistent reports in various German newspapers that a large number of ships laden with coal "are lying off Ems and elsewhere for the use of the Baltic fleet." In view of these known facts, it would seem little to the purpose to speculate as to whether Germany has or has not formally concluded a secret agreement with Russia. The "reinsurance" trick, so often practised by Germany, has quite lost its novelty, and only those utterly unacquainted with the policy of the "Wilhelmstrasse" could affect the slightest surprise if, in the near future, Count von Bülow were to announce in the Reichstag that he had "reinsured" the Empire with Russia in accordance with the approved policy of the great Chancellor. It is a perfectly legitimate policy; and, now that the peoples of England and Germany have grown somewhat estranged—which is a cause of some anxiety to the German Government—it is also a perfectly natural one. The personal efforts of the German Emperor to "reinsure" his country with England having failed as egregiously as have German diplomatic attempts to "butter" the English press, the German Government immediately perceived the necessity of having a reliable friend somewhere in the world; and, as Russia happened to be in sore need of support, it was easy enough for Germany to tender her good offices, and place her resources at the service of Russia, who, nothing loath, readily acquiesced in the bargain.

Thus what might have taken years of sedulous cultivation to bring about has been effected by the natural swing of the pendulum, almost, as it were, without any effort at all. It is the great political achievement of the Emperor William's reign, which, if signally full of hope and promise, has been curiously barren in positive result. For the Triple Alliance is not what it was when the young Emperor ascended the throne, nor can Germany's relations with England in any way be said to have improved since that date; rather is the contrary the case. Moreover, the ambitious oversea expansionist policy of the Emperor has met with unexpected, and, it would seem, almost insuperable

difficulties in the shape of the "Monroe Doctrine" on the one side, and Russian, British, French and Japanese "Imperialism" on the other. The one positive creation of the Emperor William II. is the German Navy. The growing economic rivalry between England and Germany, together with German Anglophobia and the shifty policy of Germany wherever and whenever Great Britain is concerned, have driven the two most vital peoples in Europe apart; the one into the arms of Russia, the other to make common cause with the civilization of modern France. As before said, the result is the "benevolent neutrality" of Germany to-day, and the dislocation of the old grouping of European Powers.

At this moment Germany is naturally desirous to preserve the outward semblance and forms, at any rate, of a neutral state, and particularly as the success of Japanese arms on land has far exceeded her expectations; and opinion throughout Germany grows that the end is not yet within calculable distance. The sending of Prince Anton of Hohenzollern, who is a distant relative of the Emperor, to the Mikado, though nominally in the capacity of a military attaché, is one of these little acts of political courtesy and prescience in which German diplomacy excels. His mission to Japan is a precisely similar one to that entrusted to Prince Henry some years ago, when a certain tension existed between the peoples of Germany and America. Prince Anton would appear to have been fairly successful, though the presence of a German Prince in the Japanese capital does not seem to have prevented Admiral Togo from keeping a certain number of ships off Chifu on the lookout for any chance Russian ship making a second dash for liberty to a neighboring port. There will probably be less heard now about German acts of benevolence, for one reason because, as Gretchen explained to Faust, "she had already done so much that there was hardly anything left for her to do"; and, in the second place, because it is not within the purpose of Germany to hamper her future elasticity of movement in the rôle she confidently hopes to play in the final adjustment, by revealing her cards prematurely, and rousing unnecessary resentment. But, when the hour for diplomatic action arrives, all the weight of German influence will be cast on the side of Russia, to preserve for the stricken "colossus" what it may be possible to obtain for her. For the predominance of Japanese power in the Far

East would be fatal to the realization of some of Germany's most ambitious and cherished schemes of aggrandizement, and she has no intention to stand idly by and see Japan fatten on the spoils of victory. The "Alliance" with Russia will then prove to be a very real thing. If the "Yellow Peril" bogey fails to achieve its object, other "perils" will be discovered. Germany would like best to see a Russo-German-English *condominium* controlling the affairs of the East, because that would ensure to Germany her place, enable Russia to recuperate at the expense of Japan, and keep England in a minority in the Tripartite Council until Russia and Germany felt strong enough to oust her altogether.

ROME, *October, 1904.*

A GENERAL rehearsal of revolution has been tried in Italy. This is the definition given, especially in Germany, to the attempt at a general strike in the Peninsula in the second half of September. The definition is on the whole incorrect, and the incorrectness is due partly to ignorance of local conditions in the young kingdom, partly to that diplomatic ability by which the press in Germany, even of the Opposition, indeed very often that in a larger degree, is used for political purposes in foreign affairs. In the present case, the spectre of revolution was a good string to pull from Berlin for certain directing circles and classes in Italy, which, in the eyes of the Emperor William and his Chancellor, have lately assumed a too independent attitude. This, however, should not be taken in the sense of denying a considerable gravity to the agitation which troubled for a week all the large towns with the exception of Florence.

On September 4th, at Buggerru, in Sardinia, some strikers surrounded and so threateningly attacked a detachment of soldiers, sent to the spot merely to maintain order, that the troops were obliged to fire in self-defence, killing two workmen. A few days later, at Castelluzzo, in Sicily, a non-commissioned officer of the Carabineers, without any instructions from his superiors, broke in upon a meeting of a peasant league to obtain the rules and a list of the members. On encountering resistance, he ordered his men to fire and they shot one of the peasants dead. The Government, even before this fact was generally known, and therefore without pressure either from political parties or from

public opinion, had the non-commissioned officer and his men arrested, to be tried by the ordinary courts. In both cases, no responsibility could be traced to the Cabinet; but the extreme parties raised the cry of a unanimous movement of the proletariat. The agitation was kept *sub rosâ* for some time, merely showing that it existed through the meetings of their most fiery leaders and through articles in the revolutionary press.

Meanwhile, the King was expecting a child, and great rejoicings were being prepared should the infant prove to be the so ardently desired heir to the throne. The little Prince of Piedmont came to satisfy these ambitions late on the evening of September 15th, and the next day, almost two weeks after the incidents in Sardinia and Sicily, popular indignation exploded in an order issued by the *Camera del Lavoro* (Labor Exchange) of Milan—composed for the greater part of Anarchists—which proclaimed a general strike throughout the country. This order was immediately carried into effect, not only in Milan itself, but also in Turin and Genoa and in smaller towns of Lombardy, Piedmont and Liguria, so that the Castle of Racconigi, where the royal family was staying and where the birth of the Crown-Prince had occurred, found itself suddenly surrounded by a vast mob of strikers. Shortly thereafter, Rome joined the movement, although unwillingly, from a sentiment of solidarity; and the example of the capital was followed by Venice, Naples, Messina and other less important centres. At Milan, the movement assumed an anarchist character; at Genoa, that of open rebellion, accompanied by the destruction of railway tracks and the cutting of telegraph and telephone wires, to isolate the town; at Turin and Venice, that of vandalism; while at Naples, there rose to the top the scum of the *lazzaroni,* who even used barricades to prevent the police and troops from reestablishing order.

The moment had been excellently chosen for a movement of this kind, the Government having comparatively few soldiers at its disposal, as the three years' service of the conscripts had just expired, and the new recruits were not yet under arms, while the larger part of the troops under the colors had not reentered their garrisons from the manœuvres. The day on which the strike broke out at Rome, when a great meeting was held—announced to be of 50,000 men, although in reality the number did not exceed 15,000—the authorities found that the capital had

only 3,000 soldiers available, so that the artillery also was employed to quell disturbances and charge the rioters, when, after listening to inflammatory speeches at the meeting, they attempted to invade the centre of the city with hostile intentions. Venice was in an even worse position, the prefect having at his disposal only 380 soldiers, or one for about every 500 inhabitants. At Genoa, the need of reinforcements was so urgent that commander Briggs, of the American warship "Baltimore," which happened to be in port, offered the prefect to land 350 men to help put down the rioters. The offer was courteously declined, but four Italian warships were sent to Genoa, which landed 2,000 men, while torpedo-boats and destroyers were employed to protect the railway along the Mediterranean coast, which was most seriously threatened. Notwithstanding this, the instructions sent by the Government to the authorities were to do all in their power to avoid using force in repressing the strike, and to recommend officers, soldiers and police to be patient and to endure almost anything rather than use their arms, asking this more as a patriotic sacrifice than as the performance of a duty.

The Cabinet and Signor Giolitti, who, besides being Premier, is Minister of the Interior, were accused by the Opposition of weakness, indeed were almost suspected of treason, as, it was said, repression at any cost should have been adopted when the Anarchist leaders of the strike, dragging after them Socialists, Republicans and Radicals, who joined them from political cowardice, pushed things so far as to interfere with the free working of the press, to leave the cities in total darkness, to close all the hotels, and to hinder the nursing and the feeding of the patients in the hospitals and even to prevent the burial of the dead. Signor Giolitti, however, has proved that he knows Italy and his fellow countrymen better than any one else. Less important movements than this, some of his predecessors—notably Signor Crispi, the Marquis di Rudinì and General Pelloux—by the use of strenuously repressive measures, have transformed into revolutionary attempts, such as the rising of the *Fasci* (Land Leagues) in Sicily in 1893-4, the rebellion among the marble-cutters of Carrara in 1894, the bloody riots of Milan in 1898, and the state of active discontent during the entire Pelloux administration, which seemed the prelude to civil war. On these occasions, besides the people killed and wounded by the troops, which in Milan

amounted to several hundreds, besides those sent to suffer the horrors of "forced domicile"—Crispi in 1894 having condemned 2,000 to this penalty in Sicily alone—there were almost whole parties, leaders and followers, sentenced by courts-martial, which, in the atmosphere of resentment prevalent at the moment, lacked the serenity and the impartiality of the ordinary courts, and offered no such guarantee of justice as the normal judicial procedure affords. After the movements in Sicily, Carrara and Milan, large numbers of people were thus condemned to sentences ranging from one year to imprisonment for life, thus making them political martyrs, and later rendering necessary an almost general amnesty through the pressure of public opinion. This state of ferment was especially due to the efforts of the different Cabinets to suppress by force all propaganda in favor of the economic amelioration of the lower classes, and to their policy of siding with the employers in all conflicts between capital and labor. In this policy the successive Ministries were supported by a large majority in the country, especially in the South, where the middle and upper classes are still impregnated with feudal principles, by which they have been imbued through many centuries of reactionary governments. When, over twenty years ago, the peasants of the Venetian provinces initiated their leagues of resistance, aiming at the attainment of higher wages and shorter hours of work, such disorders ensued, in consequence of the authorities supporting the landowners, that it seemed Italy was on the verge of a new Jacquerie. The Government then in power was inexorable in quenching the movement. It spread terror throughout the provinces, and arrested over 2,000 of the best-known agitators, some through blank orders which were filled in after the arrests were made, as in the worst days of the *lettres de cachet*. Such a system did not succeed in suppressing the organization of the peasants, whose leagues now number over 1,500, with nearly half a million members. They have, indeed, acquired so much power as to be able to dictate and impose conditions.

Signor Giolitti was the first statesman since the country was united to proclaim entire liberty of combination, organization and strike for working-men, laborers and peasants; but at the same time he pledged himself to guarantee liberty of work, adopting practically the principle of Waldeck Rousseau, that "*le droit de travailler d'un seul ouvrier est aussi respectable que le droit de*

tous les autres de cesser le travail."* It is difficult to imagine what would have happened if, in the recent period of economic evolution and general revival of the working-men, Italy had had one of the old-style Ministries, which, by their policy, would certainly have transformed the economic movement into political agitation, conspiracy and rebellion.

Since 1900 the Peninsula has gone through the vastest and most pacific of these movements ever recorded in its history, there having been, without counting the last general strike, over 3,000 strikes in which 1,500,000 workers participated, with the result that advantages were gained by the workmen which are estimated at 20,000,000 dollars yearly. All this was obtained without violence, with the exception of a few conflicts between strikers and troops, caused by excesses on the part of the people, or by the impulsiveness of the soldiers, as at Buggerru and Castelluzzo.

Signor Giolitti, having inaugurated and constantly followed for four years a policy of complete liberty in the struggles between capital and labor, wished to carry on that policy even under the unfavorable conditions of the late general strike, which was attempted, not certainly for the rights of the working-man or for the amelioration of his economic position, but in the hope of causing such a conflagration as would overthrow the Ministry, which is Liberal and impartial at the same time. The Premier did not deceive himself as to the risks he was running, and the damage which might result from his course; but he thought that from a different policy much greater evils would arise. He must have remembered what happened, after the unification of Italy, in Romagna, the district which was noted for its intransigeant republicanism, and which was in a state of continuous convulsion because the people wished to have the bands play Garibaldi's hymn, which was considered the republican anthem, whilst the authorities forbade it; the result was that such violent manifestations ensued that conflicts with police and troops were frequent and fatal. At last, a prefect was sent there who, seeing no harm in having a hymn played to the strains of which most of the victorious battles of Italian Independence had been fought, ordered that every band, military or civilian, should invariably begin and end its programme with the hymn of Garibaldi, and that,

* "The right of a single working-man to work is as much to be respected as that of all the others to stop working."

in addition, the hymn should be played as many times as the public desired. It is needless to say that, in a few weeks, even the most rabid republicans had lost their ardor for the disputed hymn, and peace settled over the countryside. By the same system, the present Premier has, more or less, cured the excesses which accompanied the strike. Whilst sanguinary repression would have united all the subversive and antimonarchical elements in a supreme attempt, which might even have resulted in revolution, the policy of leaving them to themselves has brought about a split, a reciprocal condemnation, and a competition between Socialists, Republicans and Radicals in disclaiming all responsibility for the excesses indulged in during the general strike. These excesses have aroused universal indignation, and will provide the best platform for the Government at the next elections, and the most effective obstacle to the return of several of the Deputies of the Extreme Left.

Through imperfect news or interested views, however, the situation may have been judged differently abroad, especially in Germany, where the feeling of independence of the Central Empires, which in late years has gradually grown in the Italian kingdom, cannot be looked upon with satisfaction. The Triple Alliance was signed in May, 1882; and Prince Bismarck, immediately after the meeting of September, 1884, at Skiernievice had no hesitation in concluding the famous defensive accord with Russia, which remained a secret for many years. Now that Italy has, on the other hand, reestablished friendly relations with France, concluding an understanding as to their reciprocal rights and duties in the Mediterranean, and an arbitration treaty, signs of jealousy are shown in Berlin, although, contrary to Prince Bismarck's policy, Italy has made no secret of the negotiations. What seems to disturb Berlin even more is a growing tendency towards intimate relations between Russia and Italy, notwithstanding the strong sympathy of the Italian people for Japan, and the hisses promised the Tsar last year, which prevented his projected visit to Rome. The friendship between Italy and Russia, which Germany opposes, fearing it will render more difficult the attainment of her desire for a monopoly of influence with the Muscovite Empire, is brought about by the relations which have long existed between the Houses of Romanoff and Savoy, the former having always assisted the latter at its most critical moments. To recall

only relatively recent events: in the eighteenth century, when King Charles Emmanuel IV. was driven from Piedmont by Napoleon I., the Tsar, Paul I., showed him the greatest sympathy, even sending Prince Czartoryski, as Minister Plenipotentiary, to Florence, where the Sovereign of Savoy had taken refuge, although Charles Emmanuel was then without a square inch of territory. In later times, when Charles Albert, great-grandfather of the present King, fell into disgrace as Regent of Sardinia, because he was too Liberal, he also took refuge in Florence, where he was met by the Russian representative, who had been instructed to do everything possible in his behalf in the name of Alexander I.

In the attitude of Russia towards the House of Savoy, a continuity of policy can easily be seen, aiming at a cardinal interest of St. Petersburg, which consists in finding allies against Austria. Piedmont, for historical, racial, political and topographical reasons, was designed to fight Austria, which possessed the best Italian provinces. In other words, Piedmont was then in Italy, with regard to Russia, what now in the Balkans is Montenegro, which fights, in its turn, Austrian influence and favors Russia, in the hope that the day will come in which, with the assistance of St. Petersburg, all the Servians will be united under the flag waving at Cettinje. Of course, the presence of a Montenegrin Queen at the Quirinal is not certainly the last or the least important link of the chain which may bind Russia and Italy. The preoccupation of Berlin, which brought about the recent meeting at Homburg between Count von Bülow and Signor Giolitti, is sufficiently justified when one considers that there is much more cordiality in the relations of Italy with England, France and Russia, than in those with her ally Austria. When the Triple Alliance was renewed, in June, 1902, Italy made a condition that she should be authorized to communicate its clauses to France, to convince that country that the Peninsula had not pledged itself to any hostile combination against the Republic. M. Delcassé was much pleased, and lost no time in officially stating to the Chamber, that, given the Triple Alliance as it now is, Italy can "neither be the instrument of, nor a party to, an aggression against France."

Among the many suppositions put forward with regard to the Homburg meeting there is one which is, perhaps, not far from

the truth. While Signor Giolitti went there to give assurances of a closer union with Germany in Italy's foreign policy, he has requested the good offices of Berlin to induce the Pope, at the next general elections, to at least tacitly allow the Clericals to vote, in order to insure the complete defeat of the extreme parties, the triumph of which, if dangerous to present institutions in the Peninsula, would certainly not be advantageous to the Church. It is no longer a secret that Pius X. was elected through Italy's inducing Germany to bring it about that Austria should veto the candidature of Cardinal Rampolla, who, besides being eminently Francophile, would have been an anti-Italian and anti-German Pontiff. Because of these circumstances and of the recent rupture between France and the Pope, no other country, perhaps, is now so influential at the Vatican as Germany, and a desire expressed by the Kaiser will certainly be considered by the Holy See.

WASHINGTON, *October, 1904.*

IT is not surprising that the outcome of the Presidential election now close at hand should be awaited with keen interest, not to say anxiety, by the representatives of foreign Powers at Washington. In view of the President's acts, and of his avowed opinions, they can forecast to a considerable extent the course which he is likely to take with reference to our foreign relations, in case he should continue to occupy the White House up to March 4, 1909. From the St. Louis Platform, from Judge Parker's speech of acceptance, from his letter of acceptance and from his later utterances, they are enabled also to obtain some light upon the consequences of a Democratic victory, so far as the management of our foreign affairs is concerned. It is worth while to note how, in the judgment of these diplomatists, their respective countries will be affected by the issue of the contest which will close on November 8th. As was to be expected, the opinions of the spokesmen of the great foreign Powers differ materially from those expressed by delegates of the Latin-American republics. It will, therefore, be convenient to consider the views of the former separately.

To begin with Great Britain, it is certain that well-informed and far-sighted servants of the British Foreign Office desire ardently the election of Mr. Roosevelt, especially since the an-

nouncement, which is understood to have emanated directly from the White House, that Mr. John Hay has been requested, and has consented, to remain Secretary of State in the event of a Republican triumph at the ballot-box. What England wants is an assurance that no incident will disturb the exceptionally cordial relation, amounting almost to informal cooperation, which has existed between her and the United States during the McKinley-Roosevelt Administrations. The knowledge that such a relation existed has exerted an unmistakable influence at St. Petersburg and Berlin, and, doubtless, has had much to do with the substantial concessions made by Russia as regards the articles which ought to be excluded from the category of absolutely contraband merchandise. Thanks to the concurrent representations made by the British Foreign Office and our State Department, it is now settled, so far as Russia's acquiescence can settle it, that food products shipped from a neutral country in a neutral ship to a belligerent are exempt from seizure, provided they cannot be proved to be destined for a belligerent fleet or army, or for a blockaded port. Of course, Russia's agreement binds only herself, and might not be accepted as a controlling precedent by another Continental Power; but, in view of the impressive demonstration that the United States and England recognize a joint interest in the matter, and are determined to safeguard it, it has become improbable that even a Continental coalition against England would venture to treat food as absolutely contraband. It is manifest that no more momentous service could have been rendered to Great Britain. The success of Mr. Roosevelt, however, is hoped for in the United Kingdom, not only on the score of favors received, but because the accession of a Democratic Chief Magistrate would be witnessed with some apprehension. A curious change has come over the attitude of the British people toward our Democratic party. Before the Civil War, British manufacturers had good reason to acclaim the ascendency of the Democracy, because it was the party of free trade. The tremendous stimulus imparted to the importation of British products into the United States during the fourteen years which followed the Walker low tariff of 1846 is still remembered vividly and longingly in Great Britain. Since the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman tariff, however, British manufacturers have ceased to believe that much advantage would accrue to them from a Democratic victory, even though it should involve not only control of the

Executive, but also preponderance in both Houses of Congress. On the other hand, British statesmen cannot be expected to forget that it was Thomas Jefferson who shut British manufactures out of the United States by an embargo, that it was disciples of Jefferson who made the War of 1812, and that it was a Democratic President who issued the Venezuela Message.

There is, undoubtedly, a startling difference between the view of the Monroe Doctrine taken by Mr. Cleveland and that exemplified in Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward the British and German occupation of La Guayra and Puerto Cabello, and subsequently expressed by him in his Cuban letter. It is true that Mr. Cleveland had beheld without protest the British occupation of a Nicaraguan seaport, but that was because the coercion administered was intended simply to exact reparation for a glaring public wrong. It was not intended to assure the payment of an ordinary debt arising out of contract. The occupation of La Guayra and Puerto Cabello, on the other hand, was designed, ostensibly and partly, to secure redress for notorious breaches of international law, but, really and principally, to enforce the recognition of obligations imposed by transactions into which foreign creditors had freely entered. Mr. Cleveland's Venezuela Message, moreover, was based expressly on the ground that England's assumption of a right arbitrarily to determine the boundary of British Guiana might amount, practically, to so serious a dismemberment of territory as would materially "affect the destiny" of a Latin-American republic, and thus violate the terms in which the Monroe Doctrine had been propounded by its author. Yet there is no doubt that, when we permitted a large part of the customs revenue of Venezuela to be confiscated by foreign Powers for an indefinite period, in order to enforce the payment of debts arising out of contract, we connived at an act which may materially "affect the destiny" of that commonwealth. Mr. Roosevelt, indeed, is disposed, if his Cuban letter has been construed correctly, to go much farther than mere passive acquiescence in a process the outcome of which might be to reduce a Latin-American republic to the condition of Egypt. He is understood to have intimated that, if our southern neighbors should fail to pay their debts, he would himself undertake a disciplinary function, which can only mean that he would take charge of their revenues, and apply them to the proper ends. Such an extension of the Monroe Doctrine is, of course,

highly acceptable to foreign creditors, and they would be ungrateful if they failed to applaud the prospect of Mr. Roosevelt's election.

There is another cogent reason for the desire of the British Foreign Office to see Mr. Roosevelt remain the President of the United States. He is pledged to the retention of the Philippines for an indefinite period, and, so long as we keep a fleet and an army in the Far East, we are in a position to cooperate effectively with Great Britain in maintaining the "Open Door" in China. Should we evacuate the islands, they would unquestionably fall either to Japan or to some European Power; and, unless that Power happened to be England, the status and influence of British subjects on the Pacific coast of Asia would be relatively weakened. On this very account, it is patent that Germany, France and Russia, and, doubtless, also, Japan, would hail Judge Parker's success at the ballot-box, because he is known to be committed to a speedy concession of absolute independence to the Filipinos. To foreign onlookers it is plain that, if the American people should sanction Judge Parker's policy of "scuttle," a scramble on the part of at least five claimants for the possession of the Philippines would immediately follow.

It is likewise clear to Transatlantic observers that, if the promises to reduce expenditure set forth in the St. Louis platform, and in the published utterances of the Democratic nominee, could and should be carried out, the present drift of the United States toward the position of a great naval, if not also a great military, Power would be abruptly checked. If the Philippines were renounced, our regular army could be, and doubtless would be, cut down to one-half, or even one-third, of its actual size; and, while the war-ships already begun would probably be completed, no further expansion of our navy would be countenanced. We should cease, thereafter, to figure as a factor of prime importance in international warfare and diplomacy. We should tend to resume our former attitude of contented isolation and of indifference to the affairs of the outside world.

So far as Germany is concerned, her statesmen are mainly interested in the results of our Presidential elections by reason of their bearing on the perpetuation of the existing friendly understanding between the United States and England. Neither a Democratic nor a Republican President would tolerate the aggrandizement of

Germany at the expense of a Latin-American republic. The only difference would lie in the comparative readiness and ability of a Republican Administration to enforce a prohibitory fiat. From their specific point of view, the advocates of the transmarine expansion of the German Empire can see but little to choose between Mr. Roosevelt and Judge Parker, though they would naturally prefer to witness the triumph of a party which, if faithful to its professions, would try to reduce the appropriations for our army and navy. There is no doubt that, in the eyes of the German Colonial party, the United States constitutes the one formidable obstacle to the fulfilment of their schemes for the creation of dependencies on this side of the Atlantic. They cannot forget that a large part of Brazil was once for several decades possessed by a Teutonic Power, the States-General of the Low Countries; and they are haunted by the consciousness that at this hour a large and growing colony of Germans exists in the most southerly province of Brazil, namely, Rio Grande do Sul. These German colonists have their own churches, schools and newspapers, and evince no inclination to fuse with the neighboring Portuguese-speaking population. There is no doubt that they would gladly transfer their allegiance from the Brazilian Republic to the German Empire. With the German navy at their back, they could easily bring about the change. It is only the Monroe Doctrine that bars the way.

The earth-hunger excited in Germany by the knowledge that her language is spoken extensively in a flourishing province of Brazil is felt still more keenly by Italians, when they look at Argentina. So great and continuous has been the outflow of emigrants from Italy to the Argentine Republic, that the number of Italian-speaking residents in that commonwealth will soon, if it does not now, exceed the number of the descendants of the Spanish conquerors. If the emigration goes on—and there is no reason to suppose that it will cease—the Italian element seems destined to preponderate so largely in the Argentine population as to assure to it the ultimate control of the Buenos Ayres Government. In that event, the Italian Monarchy might be tempted to encourage a movement for the annexation of Argentina to the Peninsula Kingdom, or, at all events, for the adoption of monarchical institutions. It will be remembered that the Church party in Mexico was instigated by Napoleon III. to repudiate the republican régime, and to

proclaim their country an empire. Of course, no second experiment of the kind would be risked, so long as the United States was known to have power enough to compel submission to the "stand-off" policy embodied in the Monroe Doctrine. But suppose our navy and our army should dwindle to the proportions which they possessed in the initial years of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration. How, then, could we enforce our wishes?

There is, evidently, one point of view from which all European nations which are engaged in manufacturing for export would be likely to regard the election of Judge Parker as beneficial to themselves. They would exaggerate the effect of the transfer of the powers of our Federal Executive to Democratic hands. Few statesmen on the Continent, and not a great many even in England, are familiar with the text of our Constitution and with the details of our political situation. It is hard for foreigners to comprehend that, even if Judge Parker were chosen President, and a Democratic majority should be returned to the House of Representatives, the ratification of reciprocity treaties between European countries and the United States would still be far distant. They cannot be made to understand that the confirmation of a reciprocity treaty would require the votes of two-thirds of the United States Senate, and that the present generation is unlikely to see the time when the high protectionists, who are firmly opposed to reciprocal tariff concessions, will not constitute more than a third of the Upper House of our Federal Legislature. It is really a matter of little practical consequence to foreign manufacturers whether a majority of the Presidential electors is secured on November 8th by Judge Parker, who favors reciprocity, or by Mr. Roosevelt, who declines to promise it.

There is one reciprocity treaty, indeed, that would have at least a chance of being negotiated and ratified, should the Democrats recover power. So many Republicans in several important States are such ardent advocates of reciprocity with Canada, that an agreement to that end might, conceivably, rally to cooperation with the Democrats a sufficient number of Republican Senators to assure confirmation. In the Dominion, however, there is much less desire for reciprocity than there was six years ago. At present, Canadian manufacturers seem determined to protect themselves against both British and American competitors. The Canadian general election, which will take place just before our own, will

show whether the agricultural or the manufacturing interest is likely to preponderate at Ottawa for some time to come. It is certain that the Maritime Provinces and the grain-producers of the Canadian Northwest would like, by means of a reciprocity treaty, to lower the tariff wall between themselves and the United States, and for that reason they would see with satisfaction the triumph of Judge Parker at the ballot-box. The manufacturers of Ontario would take a different view of the matter. One of the British colonies the inhabitants of which would vote to a man for reciprocity, is Newfoundland; it is, consequently, a well-wisher of the Democratic nominee. No doubt Jamaica, Trinidad and other sugar-producing islands in the British West Indies would also like to enter into reciprocal arrangements with us; but, unfortunately for them, our reciprocity treaty with Cuba contains a stipulation binding us not to enter into a similar convention with any sugar-growing country.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXVII.

DECEMBER, 1904.

A CENTURY OF POLITICS

BY WILLIAM A. DUNNING, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

I.

When Louisiana was acquired by the United States, the politics of the world was centred about a single nation, and the politics of this nation was centred about a single individual. France and Napoleon epitomized the dominant principles of the day; revolutionized France meant liberty and equality, the rights of man, national democracy; Napoleon, at this stage of his career, meant the resistless armed might of democratic propagandism. Before the enthusiasm of the French nation and the genius of their chosen leader, the principles, the practices and the men of the old régime vanished from Western Continental Europe. Only in Russia and in the British Isles did Conservatism find a secure refuge, and from these points of support, with the principles and material resources of England as its chief dependence, it waged unrelenting war on all things French and all things Napoleonic, and in the end it was triumphant.

With 1815 came the termination of the long wars; the smoke and shouting of battle passed away, and the readjustment of institutions and political systems began. Reaction was manifest everywhere; the dogmas and the men that for nearly twenty-five years had cowered in the remotest and obscurest hiding-places of

Copyright, 1904, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved

the Continent now assumed control of political life, and a war of extermination was entered upon against everything that had been identified with the Revolution. But the work of the French Republic and the Napoleonic Empire had been too thoroughly done throughout Western and Central Europe to permit of ready eradication, even by the drastic methods employed by Metternich and his satellites. Liberalism, proscribed and hunted by the triumphant Powers, lived nevertheless, and resisted its adversaries with the weapons that were nearest at hand—conspiracy, assassination, insurrection—as well as by ceaseless agitation and debate, so far as these were permitted in practical politics; and at last, but only when the middle of the century had been reached, it had secured a definitive triumph throughout the better part of Europe. After the revolutionary wave of 1848, the prevailing governmental systems, as well as the prevailing beliefs in both scientific and popular thought, expressed, with more or less completeness, the principles for which the Liberals had contended. And, far more fully than anywhere in Europe, these principles pervaded the government and the general life of that growing people across the Atlantic, whose development had already begun to make them a factor of large significance in the affairs of the civilized world.

This conflict between Liberalism and Conservatism, then, may be taken as marking in a general way a period in nineteenth-century politics. In the affairs of every European country, the struggle for the realization of Liberal ideas furnished the most conspicuous incidents. France was the recognized leader and gave the impulse to all Europe in this respect; and the history of her party politics is merely a recital of the strife of Liberalism and Conservatism. Spain and the Italian states exhibited a series of transformations in governmental institutions with the same division as the basis. The German states experienced many vicissitudes of agitation and insurrection; but the hand of Metternich was strong in Central Europe, and, while Liberalism got a footing in some of the smaller states, the time of the greater did not come until 1848; and even then the success of the Liberals was but temporary in Austria and greatly qualified in Prussia. England felt the effect of the spirit of the times in the great struggles for Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform, and in the abortive movement of the Chartists. Even

Russia had a little experience of uprising for Liberal government in 1825 at the accession of Nicholas, and a very serious experience with the combination of Liberalism and Nationalism in the Polish war of 1830. And, finally, the United States exhibited the influence of the *Zeitgeist* by the transition from the Jeffersonian to the Jacksonian type of democracy.

Assuming, then, that the struggle between Liberalism and Conservatism was the characteristic mark of the practical politics of the period extending to the middle of the century, let us consider what were the principles of political science that were involved in the struggle and its result.

Fundamentally, nineteenth-century Liberalism meant democracy. Its ultimate aim was to break down the bars which excluded from political life the classes of people whose intellectual, social and economic significance was becoming unmistakably predominant. For its immediate aim, it demanded liberty and equality. The content of these much-abused terms was explained in accordance with the philosophy of the eighteenth century—that is, by the dogmas which had been demonstrated by Montesquieu and Rousseau and formulated in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. "Liberty" was held to consist in a series of rights defined by Nature itself, and "equality," in the possession of all these rights by every man by the fact of his humanity. Within the sacred circle of these rights no governmental power could intrude. Against every claim of authority to do so, as derived from God or custom or tradition, was opposed the decree of supreme and beneficent Nature. The precise character of Nature—this kindly source of human rights—was no less variously and indeterminately defined by nineteenth-century than it had been by eighteenth-century philosophers; and the list of rights that were deduced, by laborious speculation, from Nature in the abstract bore a suspiciously close resemblance to one which could be compiled from the very concrete constitutional law and practice of England and the United States. Yet Nature, and Nature interpreted by reason, continued throughout the period we are discussing to be the ultimate basis of the Liberal creed.

It was, however, in regard to *civil* rather than *political* rights that the code of Nature was considered conclusive by all shades of Liberals. As to political rights, especially that of the suffrage, Liberalism was much divided. The more extreme spirits

in its ranks were quite sure that Nature and reason immutably prescribed participation in all the functions of government as the right of every man. Less radical elements found in Nature the right of representation, but not of participation, in political functions; and many were loath to admit that even participation in the designation of a representative was within Nature's gift to every man. Finally, those Liberals who shaded imperceptibly into the ranks of Conservatism itself, maintained that, while Nature enjoined indisputably the guarantee of civil rights to every man, the assignment and enjoyment of political authority were matters of human expediency, varying with times, places and circumstances, and not determinable *a priori*. Liberty to all, authority to the qualified, was the maxim of this school.

The Conservative opposition to the views and purposes of the various groups of Liberalism was embodied for the most part in the royal and aristocratic classes of the old régime. Its practical spirit was expressed in that curious intermonarchic agreement known as the Holy Alliance, in the forcible interference to suppress constitutional government in Italy, Spain and elsewhere, in the rigorous espionage and censorship over thought and expression throughout Europe, in the bitter resistance of the aristocracy in England to the diminution of their ancient prerogatives by Parliamentary reform, and in the extreme assertions of aristocratic and monarchic privilege which led to the explosions of 1830 and 1848. Philosophically, Conservatism expressed itself in three theories: first, that of the divine right of the old monarchic and aristocratic order—that political authority emanated from God and could not be questioned by any merely human agency; second, the theory that, if Nature were to be consulted at all as to the basis of political organization, her answer would be that inequality and not equality was the universal principle among men, and that, therefore, aristocracy and not democracy was the order of Nature; third, the theory that the appropriate social, legal and political institutions for any people were to be discovered, not through any assumption as to the nature of man in general, but by a consideration of the character of the particular people as revealed in its history, and that the institutions which had come to prevail at any particular time through peaceful development must be presumed to have more inherent justice and validity than any others that might be suggested.

Of these three views, the third characterized the most moderate of the Conservatives, and largely determined the actual solution of the problems of the time. It afforded a ground on which the least extreme of both Liberals and Conservatives were able, from time to time, to stand together. It triumphed in the Whig reforms in England and in the July monarchy in France; and it profoundly influenced, if it did not fully control, the application of that principle which expresses most fully the contribution of this period of the nineteenth century to political science,—the principle of Constitutionalism in both state and government.

Let us consider for a moment the source and nature of this principle. To Liberals of every shade in this period the indispensable token and guarantee of the liberty which they sought was a body of law, which should to some extent control and determine the power and procedure of the persons who exercised political authority. With few exceptions the Liberals demanded that this body of law be expressed in a written document. "Constitution" came to mean specifically "written constitution," and the triumph of Liberalism is significantly shown by the fact that, at the middle of the century, a great majority of states in the civilized world were equipped with instruments of this kind.

To Conservatism, however, the written constitution was an object of abhorrence. In practice, two features were generally insisted upon as indispensable to such a document: first, a distinct enumeration of the rights of the individual, with which government was under no circumstances to interfere; second, a description of the organs of government, and a body of rules determining their actual operation. The individual rights normally secured were those that had come to be known as natural rights, and the organs of government with which the practice of written constitutions was associated included some form of popular representative assembly. But both natural rights and popular representation were of course diametrically opposed to the ideas of the old régime; and, furthermore, the most fundamental conception of the nature of state and government that underlay the theory of a written constitution was unacceptable to Conservatives of every shade. For to the Liberals the constitution was the expression of the people's will, and had no more of permanence or immutability than that will.

Upon this view of political fundamentals, Conservatives of ev-

ery shade made aggressive war. The high priests of autocracy saw only horrid sacrilege in any meddling by the common people with the divine mystery of the state. To suppose that any written phrases, open to the interpretation of the vulgar, could express the essentials of political life, was to the obscurantists and mystics supreme foolishness. No constitution, declared Joseph de Maistre, the most brilliant exponent of this view, results from deliberation. In every constitution there is something that cannot be written, that must be left in venerable obscurity under penalty of destroying the state. The more there is that is written, the feebler is the political structure. When a nation begins to reflect upon itself, its laws and its life are already determined.

Something of the spirit of these phrases of de Maistre appeared also in the thought of the scientific and the historical schools of Conservatism. To the theory that the state is made, they opposed Topsy's idea that it merely grows. Burke's glowing denunciations of the French Revolution give the key-note of their cry. Men are in the state and subject to government, not through their own deliberate choice, but through an inexorable decree of their nature. The constitution of a given political society is never to be found in any document, however carefully framed and however solemnly proclaimed as the fundamental law. The bond which truly unites and determines a people in their social and political life consists in the aggregate of the numberless conventions and understandings through which, in the course of ages, the varying relations and institutions of the community have been developed and adapted to its greatest convenience. In other words,—and in the phrase which became the distinguishing mark of a prevailing school of political philosophy—the state is not a mechanism, but an organism. There is, indeed, a mystery in the state, but it is the mystery of all life and growth; and the remedy for intolerable ills in the state, as in the individual, is not the charlatan's panacea of death and resurrection, but the wise physician's study of the history and character of the particular condition, followed by the removal of defects in this organ and in that, without any pretence of touching the life principle itself.

This general view was that on which the practical constitutionalism of the first period of the century was worked out. It was the doctrine which the reforming Whigs in England applied,

as against the demand of Bentham and the Radicals for a remodelling of institutions in accordance with their *a priori* scheme. It was the doctrine which inspired the famous protest of Savigny against codifying, and thus assuming to stereotype, German private law. It was the doctrine, finally, which is clearly revealed by an examination of the content and working of the constitutions that resulted from the agitations of the period we are discussing. These constitutions were, indeed, written constitutions; but how different in character from the type which had been conceived in the enthusiasm of the early Revolution! In many cases, the actual document announced itself to be, not the deliberate expression of a people's will, signifying their choice of government, but the grant of certain institutions by a monarch to his subjects. Liberties were, indeed, guaranteed to the man and the citizen, but rarely the sweeping immunities that had figured in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. A representative legislature was in every case provided for, but rarely so organized as to interfere with the ancient domination of the aristocratic classes, or endowed with such power as to insure the development of more popular institutions. And, above all, there very early appeared the vexed question of the right of interpretation—the question which, in the long run, showed to every one that a written constitution was, not a remedy for all the ills that political life is heir to, but merely a palliative for some particular evil conditions at some particular times. It was under color of an interpretation of a written constitution that Charles X. of France issued his July Ordinances and precipitated the Revolution of 1830; it was by an interpretation of the Prussian Constitution that Bismarck carried through his policy of the conflict-time—an interpretation, moreover, which he, with characteristic cynicism, readily abandoned when it ceased to serve his purpose; and it was through interpretation that the constitution of the United States—the written constitution *par excellence,* the most wonderful instrument, according to Mr. Gladstone, ever struck off at a given moment by the thought and purpose of man—was made the basis for the efforts of two great masses of fellow citizens to annihilate each other.

The written constitution had, indeed, done its work by the time it had become generally prevalent. In its true character, it was found to be, not an indispensable feature of every sound

political system, but merely an ingenious expedient for facilitating the transition from one system to another. Through it the political ideals and characteristic principles of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries have been crystallized and put into form for permanent exhibition. Political antiquarians are thus enabled to study the past at their ease; lawyers can wrangle and construe and assert—sometimes with real belief at the basis of their assertion—that in the articles and sections and phrases and words of the document is to be seen the essence of the state; but, behind and all around the scanty code, the real life of the body politic goes serenely on regardless of all the puny efforts to cramp and fetter it.

In the development of nineteenth-century constitutionalism, the chief types—the unwritten and the written or, as Mr. Bryce names them, the flexible and the rigid—have been furnished by Great Britain and the United States respectively. In the long run, the British type has proved the more permanent; for the limitations on government and on sovereignty itself which were originally the characteristic mark of American constitutionalism have in large measure disappeared, and on the impressive, but unstable, foundation of necessity and destiny has arisen for the contemplation of mankind that structure which to the forefathers would have seemed such a monstrosity—the unwritten constitution of the United States.

II.

The second period of the nineteenth century, embracing the decades from the sixth to the ninth inclusive, has for the controlling topics of its politics, both theoretical and practical, Nationalism and Socialism. This is the period of Bismarck and Lincoln, of Karl Marx and, equally significant in the opposite sense, of Herbert Spencer. The constitutional liberty of the individual, the goal of the strenuous struggle of the previous decades, was now subordinated to the demand for national unity in governmental organization and majority rule in economic organization.

The idea of nationality, as the normal and natural criterion of political organization and independence, was by no means new to this period, but it now gained overwhelming importance from the practical work of Bismarck and Cavour in Europe, and from the terrific struggle through which the principle was maintained

in the United States. The working out of the idea was attended by a change of relative position among the European Powers. France was supplanted by Germany as the central figure. France, with a homogeneous population and a compact territory under a unified government, had only that interest in the principle of nationality which was incidental to the ambition of the third Napoleon. England, with Ireland on her hands, was necessarily cold toward the doctrine of nationality *per se*. Her philosophy easily conceded that the Poles were not Russians because they said they were not, and that the South-Carolinians were entitled to independence of the United States because they believed they were; but it could not admit that Irishmen were not Englishmen or were entitled to independent government for any such reasons. The German, the Italian and the American peoples, however, were able to make the principle of nationality predominant in both theory and practice.

The triumph of Nationalism in the seventh decade of the nineteenth century was promptly followed by a transformation in the principle—a transformation that has determined in large measure the later stages of political development throughout the world. In the first period of the century, Nationalism had been the sister creed of Liberalism. National independence and constitutional government had commonly been united as summing up what was just and natural in the aspirations of a people. In the name of both principles together the Poles had fought for independence of Russia, the Belgians had achieved their independence of the Dutch king, and the Italians had resisted the Austrian influence south of the Alps. Nationalism had been essentially defensive in character and application; its goal had been the release of peoples from alien governmental control. But the events of the sixties revealed a new and widely different aspect of the doctrine. Nationalism passed from defence to aggression. Its chief end came to be, not the release of a people from foreign rule, but the subjection of every people to its appropriate domestic rule. In the name of the nation, politicians, theoretical and practical, demanded a reordering of the world. God and nature and human reason and history were all triumphantly shown to have decreed that, in the homogeneous population inhabiting a continuous territory, should be the final and unquestionable unit of political organization. "National

unity" superseded the time-honored "consent of the governed" as the justifying principle of sovereign dominion. Love of liberty and of self-government, once the noblest theme of poetry and philosophy, now became mere graceless "particularism." In the name of the nation, Hanoverians, Saxons and Hessians were incorporated in the Prussian state; in the name of the nation, eleven million Southerners were harried into subjection to the Government at Washington. Political Science mapped out the whole world into geographic unities, in each of which it was solemnly declared to be the end of all human destiny that some ethnic unit should be neatly and eternally ensconced.

There were difficulties in the practical application of this, as of every other ultimate principle. Ethnic homogeneity was in last analysis rather hard to define. Some clear objective test was needed to determine where one nation ended and another began. Identity of blood, of language, of religion, of traditions, of history, were all duly tried, and all alike found wanting. Nor was the bounding of geographic unity any easier in practice. Alsace, we know, was, and doubtless still is, German because it is east of the Vosges, but equally French because it is west of the Rhine. The Alps were undoubtedly ordained by God and nature to be the divider of nations; but it is hazardous to assert the same of the scarcely less formidable Rockies. Yet, with all these difficulties perfectly apprehended, the idea still persists that there is something peculiarly natural and permanent and rational in the so-called "national state." Switzerland and Russia and Austria-Hungary are all looked upon as rather out of the orbit of the student of politics, because they do not conform to the canons of ethnic and geographic unity.

Without examining farther the characteristics of this peculiarly nineteenth-century idea of nationality, let us look a moment at the influence which the idea has had upon the development of the conception of liberty. *Pari passu* with the realization of democratic ideals in governmental organization, there had developed the antithesis of the two systems of thought familiar to us as "Socialism" and "Individualism." But vaguely and obscurely manifested during the first half of the century, the conflict between the two became well defined and furious with the triumph of constitutionalism in 1848-9. Both the opposing systems derived their lineage from the earlier Liberalism. The So-

cialist claimed that, with the people in control of the governmental organization, there could be no limit set to the power which they could justly exercise; restrictions that had been insisted upon before, when political authority was in the hands of the one or the few, had no justification, he declared, when authority was in the hands of all. The Individualist, on the other hand, steadfastly maintained that the rights of man had not ceased to exist with the triumph of democracy. The end of government, whether controlled by classes or by masses, was to protect these rights, not to override them. The state, indeed, had no other cause for its existence than to assist the individual in developing the powers that are in him, and any application of the public resources to other ends was despotism.

This modern doctrine of Individualism, having its source in the idealism of the German Fichte and Humboldt at the beginning of the nineteenth century, received a very perfect development through the works of the English Mill and Spencer in the fifties and sixties. England at this date had just abandoned her ancient system of agricultural protection; and her philosophers, followed by many in other lands, were enthusiastically in favor of extending over the whole field of commerce and industry the *laissez-faire* which had been applied to English agriculture. Paternalism, which, after all, lies always close behind the fraternalism, of the Socialist, was without doubt distinctly overpowered by that ardor for individualistic liberty which was so widespread in the two decades following the middle of the century. If since then Socialism and Paternalism have gained the upper hand, and government is now conceived rather as an agency for the positive promotion of the interests of those classes who control it, the result may be traced to that passion for Nationalism which supplanted the passion for constitutionalism. With the cry that industrial independence was essential to the complete national life, the United States and Germany took the lead in reversing the tendency which England's free-trade policy had created, and gradually all the leading nations of the earth fell into line with them. In the presence of universal tariff barriers, in which the powers of government are most extensively and ingeniously employed for the primary advantage of specific classes, it is hard to find an adequate ground on which to resist the demand of any other class for a similar employment of gov-

ernmental power in behalf of its interests. Nationalism has sounded the knell of Individualism—whether forever or not, it remains for the future to disclose.

Another conspicuous feature of nineteenth-century politics that experienced serious if not irreparable disaster through the Nationalistic movement was the doctrine of federalism. As the principle upon which the United States developed its astonishing progress in the first half-century, federalism came to be regarded as the touchstone of pure gold in governmental organization. The most logical constitution-makers in the world, the publicists of Latin America, brought forth a large crop of systems embodying this vital principle. Witness the United States of Mexico, the United States of Colombia, the United States of Venezuela, the United States of Brazil, and so on. Though federalism was, in its first application, merely a more or less mechanical device for combining previously well-defined and independent political units into a single system, there came later to be found in it the invaluable principle of local self-government. The partition of power between central and state organizations was treated, not merely as an essential to the union of distinct sovereignties, but as a guarantee of individual liberty against all sovereignty. But the sweep of nationalizing sentiment obliterated this beneficent conception. In realizing the ends and aspirations of the nation, the autonomy of states received as little consideration as the rights of individuals. Centralization of power, in the name and for the purposes of national unity, accompanied the progress of every body politic in which federalism had for any reason obtained a hold.

III.

After this very general survey of the tendencies manifested in the nationalistic stage of the century's progress, we are able to understand very readily the influences which have produced the later and final stage. This, covering the last fifteen or twenty years, may with a fair degree of accuracy be designated the era of the new imperialism. The events that have given character to this period are so recent and familiar as not to need detailed recital. The broad principle that has underlain them is that the nation, perfected through the suppression of Individualism and of federalism, must break the bonds of ethnic and geographic homogeneity and project its beneficent influence into the world at

large. Such, at all events, is the philosophic theory of the movement. The practical aspects of the operation have, of course, been of a rather less exalted nature. The impulse has come from the demand for markets on the part of the highly stimulated industries of Germany and the United States. It was in the eighties that the Germans instituted that picturesque world-wide hunt for colonial lands that gave such a shock to Great Britain and such amusement to the rest of mankind. It was in 1890 that Africa was parcelled out, with a brave paraphernalia of "spheres of influence" and "Hinterlands" for the parcellers, but with no sign of respect for ethnic and geographic unity among the parcelled. Three years later, the unmistakable ambition of the American people to manifest their power beyond their national boundaries was thwarted, though with great difficulty, by President Cleveland; but in 1895 he also gave way, and by his Venezuelan message unchained the passions and aspirations which found a temporary satisfaction in the incidents and results of the war with Spain. The United States, the most perfect type of advanced democracy and Nationalism, entered fully upon the task of governing distant and hopelessly alien peoples by the methods of autocracy. In the movement for the final partition of Asia into spheres of influence for the European powers—a movement to which the indomitable will and energy of one brave little Asiatic people has raised up an obstacle which at present seems likely to be insuperable—the great American Republic has taken a recognized place, as a regulating, if not a promoting, factor. There no longer remains one first-class nation whose conscious aim is internal perfection rather than external dominion—not one that does not see in dependencies the indispensable proof of political competence. Constitutionalism and Nationalism have been superseded as controlling dogmas in the world's politics.

What, now, is the meaning of this new imperialism? Is there in it anything really new? Is it any different from the imperialism of Athens in the days of Pericles or the imperialism of Rome when Julius Cæsar took the helm? Has it for its foundation anything different from the principle proclaimed by Machiavelli that no state, whether monarchic or popular, can live a peaceful and quiet life, but each must either conquer or be conquered? Or anything other than the doctrine of the doughty Thomas Hobbes, transferred from the individual to the nation,

that life consists in an unceasing struggle for power after power, that ends only with the grave? Or anything different from the principle to which the theories of evolution lend support, that a nation, like any other organism, must either grow or die?

To very many thoughtful supporters of the new imperialism a way of escape from the implications of these questions appears in the conception that the modern movement is essentially altruistic—that it is founded upon duty to others rather than satisfaction of our own desires. This is not a new idea in the history of politics. Athens pointed to the beneficent effects of her supremacy upon the subject states. The philosophical clients of the plundering Roman proconsuls could always declaim with great effect upon the rescue of suffering peoples from misrule and upon the uplifting influence of the *pax Romana*. Likewise the supporters of our modern imperialism find comfort in the good that has been done. The British in India, it is said, have abolished suttee; the French in Africa have made Timbuctoo accessible to the methods of modern commerce and to the allurements of Parisian art; the Germans have made the forms of their bureaucracy familiar in darkest Kiao-Chao; and the United States has at least instilled into the minds of the Igorrotes the moral significance of trousers in the White House.

Whether or not the bestowal of these and other even more important blessings of Aryan civilization upon races that yearn passionately to be uncivilized is the true and an adequate justification of the modern imperialism, it is not the province of this paper to determine. Its function is fulfilled in setting forth the mere succession of ideals and leading principles that has characterized the past century. The constitutionalism of the first period took a form which was in some measure novel in the history of politics; the nationalism of the second period presented also certain features that had no precedent; but the imperialism that closed the century's record can hardly be said to have manifested thus far any characteristics that distinguish it from the movements in which throughout all history the powerful governments of the earth have extended their sway over the weak and incapable.

WILLIAM A. DUNNING.

ENGLISH FEELING TOWARDS AMERICANS.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

THE perilous question whether the English like the Americans better than formerly is one which I hope to leave where I found it. An Englishman might counter by asking whether the Americans like the English better than formerly; but that would not be answering the question. Yet Americans have heard and read so much of their increasing national acceptance with their contemporary ancestors that they may be excused, if not satisfied, in a curiosity as to the fact. Is the universal favor which an emotional and imaginative press like ours has portrayed them as presently enjoying in England a reality; or is it one of the dreams which our press now and then indulges, and of which the best that can be said is that they do no harm?

I.

One not only hears of this favor at home, but, when one goes to England, one still hears of it. To be sure one hears of it mainly from Americans, but Americans have the best means of knowing the fact; they are chiefly concerned, and they are supported in their belief by the almost unvaried amenity of the English journals, which only very rarely take the tone towards Americans formerly habitual with them. Their change of tone is the most obvious change which I think Americans can count upon noting when they come to England; and I am far from reckoning it insignificant. It did not happen of the newspapers themselves; it must be the expression of a prevalent mood, if not a very deeply rooted feeling, in their readers. One hears of their interest, their kindness, not from the Americans alone; the English themselves sometimes profess it; and, if they overestimate it, their generous error is in the right direction. At the end it must cease to be an

error, for, as we Americans all know, we need only to be better understood in order to be more highly prized. Besides, liking is much oftener the effect of willing than has been supposed.

But if the case were quite the contrary, if it were obvious to the casual experience of the American traveller or sojourner in England that his nationality is now liked less rather than more there, I should still be sorry to disturb what is at the worst no worse than a fond illusion. But the case is by no means the contrary; and yet, in consenting to some reason in the iridescence which the situation in the American fancy wears, I should wish to distinguish. For a beginning, I should not wish to go farther than to say, that the sort of Englishmen who have always liked Americans, because they liked the American ideal and the kind of character realized from it, now probably like them better than ever. They are, indeed, less critical of our departure from our old ideal than some Americans, perhaps because they have not foreseen, as such Americans have foreseen, the necessary effect in American character. They can still allow themselves the pleasure which comes from being confirmed in an impression by events, and in that pleasure they may somewhat romance us; but even such Englishmen are not blindly fond of us. The other sort of Englishmen, the sort that never liked our ideal or our character, probably now like us as little as ever, except as they have noted our change of ideal, and expect a change of character. To them, we may very well have seemed a sort of civic dissenters, with the implication of some such quality of offence as the notion of dissent suggests to minds like theirs.

But it is safe to conjecture that this sort of Englishman is too old, or too old-fashioned, to live much longer; he suffers with the decay of certain English interests which the American prosperity imperilled before it began to imperil English ideals, if it has indeed done so. His dying out counts for an increase of favor for us; we enjoy through it a sort of promotion by seniority.

But a new kind of Englishman has come up of late years; and, so far as he is friendly to us, his friendliness should be more gratifying than that even of our older friends. He has been in America, either much or little, and has come to like us because he has seen us at home. If such an Englishman is rich and noble, he has seen our plutocracy, and has liked it because it is lively and inventive in its amusements, and profusely original in its

splendors; but he need not be poor and plebeian to have seen something of our better life, and divined something of our real meaning from it. He will not be to blame if he has not divined our whole meaning; for we are at present rather in the dark as to that ourselves; and, certainly, no American who met him in England could wish to blame him at all, for his cordiality forms the warmest welcome that the American can have there. If he has been in America and not liked us, or our order or ideal, he has still the English good-nature; and if you do not insist upon being taken nationally, there are many chances that he will take you personally, and, if he finds you not at all like an American, he will like you, as he liked others in America whom he found not at all like Americans.

II.

It is the foible, however, of many Americans, both at home and abroad, that they want to be taken nationally, and not personally, by foreigners. Beyond any other people, we wish to be loved by other peoples, even by others whom we do not love, and we wish to be loved in the lump. We would like to believe that somehow our sheer Americanism rouses the honor and evokes the veneration of the alien; and, as we have long had a grudge against the English, we would be particularly glad to forget it in a sense of English respect and affection. We would fain believe that the English have essentially changed towards us; but we might easily deceive ourselves, as we could realize if we asked ourselves the reasons for such a change.

The English are very polite, far politer than they have been represented to be; and they will not wittingly wound the American visitor, unless for just cause, like business, or the truth. Still, I should say that the American will fare best with them if he allows himself to be taken individually, rather than typically. One's nationality is to others, after a first moment of surprise, a bore and a nuisance, which cannot be got out of the way too soon. I cannot keep my interest in a German or an Italian because he is such; and why should not it be the same with an Englishman in regard to Americans? If he thinks about our nationality at all, in its historical character, it is rather a pill, which he may be supposed to take unwillingly, whether he believes we were historically right or not. He may say just things about it, but he will say them more for the profit of Englishmen than for the pleasure

of Americans. With our pleasure, nationally, an Englishman is very little concerned, and either he thinks it out of taste to show any curiosity concerning us, in the bulk, or else he feels none. He has lately read and heard a good deal of talk about us; but I doubt if it has indelibly impressed him. If we have lately done things which in their way could not be ignored, they could certainly be forgotten, and many Englishmen, in spite of them, still remain immensely incurious about us. The American who wishes to be taken nationally by them must often inspire them with a curiosity about us before he can gratify it.

III.

The English have, or they often express, an amiable notion of us as enormously rich, and perhaps they think we are vain of our millionaires, and would be flattered by an implication of wealth as common to us all as our varying accent. But it is as hard for some of us to live up to a full pocket as for others to live up to a full brain. It is hard even to meet the expectation that you will know, or know about, our tremendously moneyed people, whose fantastic gorgeousness looms up across the Atlantic, from the cliffs of Newport or the millionaire blocks along Fifth Avenue. Here, indeed, is a curiosity which you do not have to inspire before you gratify it, for it exists already; while, as to our political affairs, or even our military or naval affairs, not to speak of our scientific or literary affairs, the curiosity that you gratify you must first have inspired. The glories of our triumphs over Spain, and our dazzling victories in the Philippines are already tarnished, but the splendid follies of our rich society are always fresh. Travelled Englishmen have come home and told of them; and is it all true?

Their curiosity on the point does not judge them, as might be supposed. The English are very romantic, with a young, lusty appetite for the bizarre and the marvellous, as their taste in fiction evinces; and they need not be contemned as sordid admirers of money because they wish to know the lengths it can go to with the people who seem to be just now making the most money. Their interest in a phenomenon which we ourselves have not every reason to be proud of, is not without justification, as we must allow if we consider a little; for, if we consider, we must own that our greatest achievement in the last twenty or thirty years has been in the heaping up of riches. Our magnificent success in

that sort really eclipses our successes in every other, and the average American who comes abroad must be content to shine in the reflected glory of those Americans who have recently, more than any others, rendered our name illustrious. If we do not like the fact, all that we have to do is to set about doing commensurate things in art, in science, in letters, or even in arms. For the present, we have not done them, or at least we are not doing them. The five-hundred-thousand-selling novel itself is a proof of our pecuniary, rather than our literary, prowess.

It will not quite do to say that the non-millionaire American enjoys in England the interest mixed with commiseration which is the lot of a poor relation of the great among kindly people. That would not be true; and, possibly, in the last analysis, the fact is merely that the name "American" first awakens in the English some such associations with riches as the name "South African" awakened before it awakened others more poignant and more personal. Already the South African had begun to rival the American in the popular imagination; as the Boer War fades more and more into the past, the time may come when we shall be confusedly welcomed as "Africans" or "South Americans."

IV.

If I were to offer what I have been saying as my opinions, or my conclusions from sufficient observations, I should be unfair, if not uncandid. The sum of what one sees and hears in a foreign country is as nothing to the sum of what one does not see and hear; and the immense balance may be so far against the foregoing inferences that it is the part of mere prudence to declare that they are not my opinions or conclusions, but are only impressions, vague and hurried, guesses from the cursory observations, deductions from slight casual incidents. They are mere gleams from social facets, sparks struck out by chance encounter, and never glancing lights from the rarefied atmosphere in which the two nations have their formal reciprocities. For all that I have really the right to say, from substantial evidence to the contrary, I might very well say that the English value us for those things of the mind and soul which we are somewhat neglectful of ourselves; and it is only their love of fairy tales which is taken with the notion of an opulence so widespread among us as to constitute us a nation of actual and potential millionaires.

They would hasten to reproach me, I am afraid, for speaking of England, though merely for purposes of illustration, as "a foreign country." One is promptly told that Americans are not regarded as foreigners in England, and is left to conjecture one's self a sort of middle species between English and alien, a little less kin than Canadian and more kind than Australian, though not equally within the scope of a preferential tariff. The idea has its quaintness; but the American in England has been singularly unfortunate if he has had reason to believe that the kindness done him is not felt. What has always been true of the English is true now. They do not say or do the thing which is not, out of politeness; their hypocrisies, if they have any, are for their God, and not for their fellow man. When they talk of their American brethren, they mean it; just as when they do not talk of them so, they mean something less, or nothing at all. The American who wishes to be taken nationally, may cordially trust any expression friendly to our nation that he hears; but, still, I think he will have a better time if he prefers being taken personally. That is really making one's self at home in a different, I will no longer say a "foreign," country; the English are eager hosts, and wish you to make yourself at home if they like you. Nationally, we cannot make ourselves, or be made, at home, except in the United States. To any other people, to people even sometimes claiming to be nearer than the first degree of cousinship, our nationality, taking it in bulk, is necessarily a mystery. We are so very like them; why should we be so very unlike them? The difference puzzles them, annoys them; why seek points of it, and turn them to the light? The same mystery distresses the Americans when the points of their own difference are turned to the light. A man's nationality is something he is justly proud of, but not till it is put aside can the man of another nation have joy of him humanly, spiritually.

If you insist upon talking to the English about American things, you have them in an unknown world, a really unknowable world, as you yourself know it; and you bewilder and weary them; unless they are studying Americanism, and then they still do not quite understand you. I say again that I do not know why any one should wish to be caressed for his nationality. I think one might more self-respectfully wish to be liked for one's self than joined with a hundred million compatriots, and loved in the lump. If the English, however, are now trying to love us nationally, we

should be careful not to tax their affections too heavily, or demand too much of them. We must remember that they are more apt to be deceived by our likeness to themselves than by our unlikeness. When an Englishman and an American meet on common ground, they have arrived from opposite poles. The Englishman, though he knows the road the American has come, cannot really imagine it. His whole experience of life has taught him that, if you have come that road, you are not the kind of man you seem; therefore, you have not come that road, or else you are another kind of man. He revolves in a maze of hopeless conjecture; he gives up trying to guess your conundrum, and reads into you the character of some Englishman of parallel tradition. If he likes you after that, you may be sure it is for yourself, and not for your nation. All the same, he may not know it, and may think he likes you because you are an agreeable American.

V.

My line of reasoning, or I had better say of fancying, (that, on such dangerous ground, is safest,) is forcing an inference from which I shrink a little. But the candor which I would be so glad not to practise obliges me to say, that I think the American who is himself interesting would have been as welcome in England twenty-five years ago as at this day, and he would not have been expected to be rich, or to have the acquaintance of rich Americans. Already, at that remote period, certain fellow countrymen of ours had satisfied the English taste for wildness in us. There had been Buffalo Bill, with his show, and there had been other Buffalo Bills, literary ones, who were themselves shows. There had arisen a conjecture, a tardy surmise, of an American fineness then, which might be as well in its way as the American wildness; and the American who had any imaginable touch of this found as warm a liking ready for him then as the wild American found earlier, or the rich American finds later.

In fact, interesting Americans have always been personally liked in England, if I must really go to the extreme of saying it. What the English now all join in owning, if the question of greater kindness between the two countries comes up, is that their ruling class made a vast mistake in choosing, officiously, though not officially, the side of the South in our Civil War. They own it frankly, eagerly. But they owned the same thing frankly, if not

so eagerly, twenty-five years ago. Even during the Civil War, I doubt if an acceptable American would have suffered personally among them. He would have suffered nationally, but he has now and then to suffer so still, for they cannot have the same measure of his nationality as he, and they necessarily tread upon its subtile circumferences here and there.

From the very beginning of Americanism the case has been the same. The American in England during the Civil War was strangely unfortunate if he did not meet many and great Englishmen who thought and felt with him; and, if there were now any American so stricken in years as to be able to testify, from his own experience, of the English attitude towards us in the War of Independence, he could tell us of the outspoken and constant sympathy of Chatham, Burke, Fox, Walpole, and their like, with the American cause, which they counted the English cause. He could tell of the deep undercurrent of favor among the English people, which the superficial course of power belied, and at last ceased to control, in our earlier vital war, as well as in our later.

So much for that consideration of us nationally which I do not think England, in her quality of hostess, is bound to show her several American guests. I do not blame her that the sympathy of her greatest sons, so far as it has been shown us nationally, has been shown in her interest, which they believed the supreme interest of mankind, rather than in our interest, which it is for us to believe the supreme interest of mankind. Even when they are talking America, they are thinking England; they cannot otherwise; they must; it is imperative; it is essential that they should.

We talk of England on the same terms, with our own inner version. Once an eminent Englishman spoke, across the table to an American, of our Revolution as the "Rebellion." The American in return quietly said "Revolution," and the Englishman took instant note of the difference and did not fail afterwards to say "Revolution." I think the American was wise to consider that the word "Revolution," to that Englishman, could and did mean only the Revolution of 1688, when James II. was driven from power, and a new succession to the throne established.

VI.

There is another point in this inquiry which I hesitate to touch, and which, if I were better advised, I should not touch; that is

the English interest in the beauty and brilliancy of our women. Their charm is now magnanimously conceded and now violently confuted in the public prints; now and then an Englishman lets himself go—over his own signature, even, at times—and denounces our women, their loveliness, their liveliness, their goodness, in terms which, if I repeated them, would make some timider spirits pause in their resolution to marry English dukes and run English society. But his hot words are hardly cold, before another Englishman comes to the rescue of our countrywomen, and lifts them again to that pinnacle where their merits, quite as much as the imagination of their novelists, have placed them. Almost quite as much as our millionaires, they are the object of a curiosity which one has not had to inspire. Where, in what part, in which favored city, do they most abound? What is the secret of their dazzling wit and beauty, the heart of their mystery? The most ardent of their votaries must flush in generous deprecation when these orphic inquiries flow from lips quite as divine as their own.

For the rest, if there is really that present liking for Americans in England, which we must wish to touch with all delicacy as the precious bloom of a century-plant at last coming to flower, the explanation may be sought perhaps in an effect of the English nature to which I shall not be the one to limit it. They have not substantially, so much as phenomenally, changed towards us. They are, like ourselves, always taking stock, examining themselves to see what they have on hand. From time to time, they will, say, accuse themselves of being insular; and then, suddenly, they invite themselves to be Continental, to be French, to be German, to be Italian, to be Bulgarian, or whatever; and, for a while, they believe that they have become so. All this time they remain immutably English. It is not that they are insensible of their defects; they tell themselves of them in clamorous tones; and, of late, possibly, they have asked themselves why they are not what they think the Americans are in certain things. If the logic of their emotions in this direction were a resolution to like all the Americans with a universal affection, I should admire their spirit; but I should feel a difficulty in its operation for a reason which I hesitate to confess: I do not like *all* the Americans myself.

W. D. Howells.

THE WHITE PERIL: THE IMMEDIATE DANGER OF THE NEGRO.

BY WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

On a recent tour of the Southern States, from Virginia to Texas, I took with me two pictures of Southern civilization at earlier periods. One was Frederick Law Olmsted's record of his travels in the South near the close of the slavery régime—a series of volumes which John Morley and the late E. L. Godkin have both thought worthy of comparison with Arthur Young's "Travels in France." The other was my own abundant memories of Southern life in the period immediately after Reconstruction.

Comparing my present-day observations with these two presentments of the past, I was convinced that a very important and a very deep change, a change in the basis of the entire industrial system of the South, is quietly in progress. For confirmation, I have turned to the elaborate and painstaking Report on the Negroes which has recently issued from the Bureau of the Census at Washington. Confirmations of a sort I do seem to find there; but it is extremely doubtful if from that source alone I should ever have derived my conviction. In presenting it, therefore, I shall rely rather on the concrete observations of my journey than on the figures which may seem to sustain them. These would not have their full value nor their true significance unless one applied them ceaselessly to a mental picture of the South as it is, and to Southerners as they are, and to negroes and mulattoes as they are—not to dehumanized "whites" and "blacks."

It is a century, perhaps, since Virginia ceased to be the main source of the controlling tendencies of Southern life. Her soil is no longer the best ground for the study of the civilization which had its rise there. Geography, however, abets the suggestion of history that any examination of the South should begin there:

and, if one is looking particularly for signs of economic and industrial change, Virginia is by no means to be neglected. It is doubtful if in any but the very youngest of the States deeper social changes could be observed than in this, the oldest.

Two movements of population are, perhaps, the most important: an exodus and an immigration. There is a steady and widespread movement of negroes from the countrysides into the towns, and out of the State into the North; and there is a moderate but fairly steady, and apparently increasing, inflow of whites. The gain of whites from without is not, it is true, so rapid as in many other parts of the country. The rate is probably below the average for the Atlantic tier of States. Neither is it equal to Virginia's present capacity and demand for white population: for there is much waste land within her borders that would yield a fair return to careful husbandry, there are many still untrodden avenues to wealth. But it is certainly interesting to learn that farmers from the far Northwest are coming nowadays in considerable numbers, sometimes in little colonies, to make their homes on the banks of the James and the Potomac and the Roanoke. What is still more significant is that some portion of our immense immigration from Europe is at last being diverted, be it only in driblets and wavelets, from the great Eastern cities and the growing States of the West and Northwest to the oldest of all the Southern States.

And it is not unreasonable to hope that immigration of both these kinds, which for a century and more the South has in vain desired, may continue to increase. The movement of the blacks townward and Northward is so widespread and persistent that it is only natural to wonder who will take their places on the farms. All over the State, complaints are heard of the scarcity of agricultural labor. Equally common is the complaint that the negro as a laborer, particularly as a farm-hand, is deteriorating. It is harder and harder, one hears on all sides, to bind him to the soil or to long terms of service in any line; and he is likely to leave at the very seasons when the farmer needs him the most. The situation,—taken with the fact of an increase of immigration, suggests the curious possibility of a sort of second colonization of the oldest of all our shores.

Even in the cities, though the proportion of negroes in the urban population has not declined, it is plain that more and

more white men are turning to kinds of work which used to be done by negroes only. In domestic service, it is true, this is not the case; and in justice it must be said that of all negro domestic servants the best are doubtless to be found in Eastern Virginia. The negroes of that region have profited by the longest training—and in the best school of manners—that any portion of the race has ever anywhere received. But it is plain that the whites are gaining in the shops and mills and factories, and in many other employments, in the Virginian towns. In the cities, working-men's suburbs, where the children one sees about the doors are white, are growing quite as fast as the quarters given over to negroes. This, it may as well be said at once, is true also of the cities in other parts of the South.

In the cities and towns of the Carolinas, where such a rapid progress has been made in the manufacture of cotton and of tobacco, these tendencies are even more strikingly exhibited. The new industrial movement in those States has been strongest in the interior counties, particularly in what is called the Piedmont section. The Piedmont country has always been the habitat of the small white farmer; and it is people of this class in whom and by whom the important changes have been wrought. It is chiefly they who have manned the new mills and factories, populated the new manufacturing towns, and increased so rapidly the population of the transformed older towns. To any one familiar with the old Southern class distinctions, this will be apparent from the briefest visit to such a place as Charlotte, in North Carolina, or Spartanburg, in South Carolina. The newcomers, it is easy to see, are "up-country folks"; and according to the nomenclature of his own particular quarter of the South the visitor will set them down as "Crackers," as "Moss-backs," as "Red-necks," as "Hillians," as "Coveites," as "Wool-hats," or as "Copperas-breeches."

True, there are negro quarters in all the larger towns of the Piedmont region, though not in the cotton-mill villages. It is true also that there are negroes employed in the tobacco factories. In these establishments, in fact, one finds them at work side by side with the whites, frequently on the same piece and at the same machine. That is a phenomenon which might have been observed in Richmond also. It is nowhere in the South quite so common a sight as to suggest the lying down together of the lion and the

lamb. If, however, we consider it with a right historical perspective, the real sign of change is in the white man's being there, not in the presence of the negro.

In the cotton-mills, the negro is not to be found at all. A few years ago, one could have found him in a mill at Charleston, owned and managed by white men. Until a few months ago, he could also have been found in a little mill at Concord, in North Carolina, owned and managed by members of his race. But with the failure of these two experiments he seems to have disappeared entirely from the cotton industry of the South Atlantic and South Central States. The only cotton-mill in the entire South which now employs negroes is, I believe, at Dallas, Texas.* Meanwhile, to meet the demand for mill-hands in the Carolinas alone, from fifty to a hundred thousand white people have given up other employments,—mainly, no doubt, farming.

The failure of the negro to find a place in this industry, now firmly established in the South, and growing with an amazing growth, is too big a fact to be taken without some scrutiny of the tests by which his unfitness for it seems to have been established. At least two very high authorities are decidedly of opinion that the trials which have been made of negro labor in the cotton-mills are by no means conclusive. The president of half a dozen large and successful mills points out† that the experiment at Charleston was made under conditions which would probably have been fatal even if white labor had been employed. The industry never has taken root in the coast towns, nor, indeed, in any old urban community like Charleston. It is understood that the machinery of the Charleston mill was old; and a principal advantage of the Southern mills in general is that their machinery is of the newest and the best. The labor employed was not carefully selected, nor in any way segregated. The chances are that the capital behind the enterprise was inadequate. That was also the case in the experiment at Concord. In this view, Principal Washington, of Tuskeegee, concurs.‡ He believes that negro labor could be successfully used under the conditions which have been found essential with white labor: that is to say, in a segregated mill settlement, owned and controlled by the owners of the plant, and with adequate capital, competent management, and new machinery.

* A silk-mill at Fayetteville, N. C., operated by negroes, is said to be successful.

† In conversation with the writer. ‡ In a letter to the writer.

In this reasoning there is much force. But a lost battle is not restored by proving that it ought to have been won. It may not help the matter to explain that the field was unfavorable, the tactics bad, the odds unfair. Insufficient and inconclusive as the tests have been, the event may prove that the negro's chance in the cotton-mills is, none the less, lost forever. The mill president whose view has been given is not desirous of seeing the question reopened. The industry is in a good way as it is. The South is rapidly gaining on all the other centres of it. Every year, the white labor employed in the mills grows more and more skilful. It is also being trained systematically for the manufacture of finer and finer grades of cottons. Moreover, usage is fast hardening into custom, and custom soon makes rights. It is now quite probable that the Carolina mill-hands would instantly rebel at any such association with negroes as the operatives in tobacco factories accept as a matter of course. The superintendent of the largest mill in the Carolinas is positive that if a single negro operative were brought into it every man, woman, and child in the establishment would walk out. Even if no attempt were made to introduce negroes in the same mills with whites it is by no means certain that the whites would endure their competition.

The reader, no doubt, begins already to understand the nature of the change in the South's industrial system which my journey was by this time leading me to think that I perceived. What the Carolinas seem to exhibit better, perhaps, than any other part of the South is the rapid emergence of the native poor whites, the South's great unutilized industrial reserves, from the narrow limitations which slavery set them, and which nearly three hundred years of ignorance, inertia, and prejudice had strengthened into a Chinese wall of hopeless conservatism. They have come at once into competition with the negroes,—either direct, and on fairly equal terms, as in the tobacco factories, or indirect, and far more fatal to the negroes, as in the cotton-mills. What at present appears is that they no sooner entered into this great industry than the negroes were excluded from it altogether. The victory is signal. The effect of the exclusion on the negro's future can scarcely be overestimated. But this is only one of many advantages which in the townward movement, strong in both races, the poor white is winning in the search for town employments.

It is certainly not unreasonable to associate these facts with the other movement among the negroes—the movement Northward.

Of that, however, less is heard as one travels farther Southward and Southwestward. Florida is evidently gaining negroes fast by migration, and the movement Southwestward, to the prairies and river-bottoms of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, continues fairly steady. Nevertheless, in the cities and towns of the Lower South also, even in those of the Black Belt, it is apparent that the white people are changing their attitude toward the manual occupations. For one sign of the change, white barbers are now common, even in the smaller country towns. Twenty years ago, they were extremely rare outside of the real cities. A still more striking innovation is the occasional employment of white women, presumably from the up-country, as chambermaids in hotels—even, in one instance, in a hotel where the other servants are colored. It was left, however, for New Orleans, the largest of all distinctively Southern cities, to exhibit the general change more variously and convincingly than any other.

The population of New Orleans is peculiarly good material for the study of race relationships. The mixture, not of races merely, but of customs and standards, of traditions and ideals, is extraordinary. Yet it does not require a long observation of the present situation there to make one feel sure that the African has lost ground relatively to all the rest. It is possible now to live in New Orleans as free from any dependence on the services of negroes as one could be in New York or Boston. The supply of white domestic servants is, no doubt, still scant. But white cooks and waiters are not very hard to find; and white barbers and hair-dressers, white carpenters and joiners and masons and blacksmiths and shoe-makers, and the like, are at hand in sufficient numbers. Bricklaying is by a competent authority* declared to be the only trade which the negroes still control. The contrast in these occupations with the very recent past is fairly startling. In 1870, the city directory showed a total of 3,460 negroes at work as carpenters, cigar-makers, painters, clerks, shoe-makers, coopers, tailors, bakers, and blacksmiths and foundry hands. There are not to-day ten per cent. of that number of negroes employed in the same trades, several of which have been completely lost to the

* Mr. Norman Walker, of the "Times-Democrat," whose knowledge of New Orleans, past and present, is most thorough.

whites. Yet, meanwhile, the negro population of New Orleans has increased by more than fifty per cent.—a greater gain than the white population shows. The mass of the negroes are now enrolled in the occupations which require the least intelligence and skill, the class called merely "laborers" absorbing thousands.

It is actually held that in property and in social station, as well as in industry, the negroes of New Orleans are worse off today, relatively and absolutely, than they were in the year 1860. The statement may be misleading, however, unless one takes account of the unique place which the city held in Southern civilization while slavery persisted. It was the Mecca of free negroes. The Latin element in the white population was proportionally stronger than at present; and as a rule the Latins do not treat negroes as Anglo-Saxons do. Nowhere else in the South could a man with a single drop of African blood in his veins attain the degree of social acceptance which a considerable class of mulattoes enjoyed at New Orleans. A peculiar local custom went far to account for this, and for the material well-being, the intelligence, and the refinement of manners, which the New Orleans mulattoes frequently displayed. From an early period in the history of the town, a system of concubinage prevailed there, which was quite unlike the ordinary illegitimate intercourse between the races. Arrangements with something of the character of morganatic marriages were common. The children of such unions were usually well taken care of, and often highly educated, not infrequently at Paris. Abroad, they easily passed for white. At home, they had a social life of their own which was not without grace and elegance. But they enjoyed none of the rights of citizenship, and were always enumerated as negroes.

There is no more curious effect of emancipation than the fate which has befallen the survivors and the descendants of this unfortunate class. Their habits and training under slavery had unfitted them for the opportunities which freedom brought; and freedom denied them the peculiar place which slavery had kept open. Some of them made their way to France, where it is probable that their origin is not known. But the greater number were simply driven into the negro quarters of the town; and there they have gradually lost their separateness and ceased to be a class. The faces of their children are darker than theirs; their grandchildren's, darker still. The airs and graces of the half-

world are gone, along with the occupation they were won and worn in. Its shame and its curious distinctions and privileges have been lost together. It must be added that what is true in this peculiar way of New Orleans is true in another way of the other cities of the South. In the lowest of all human competitions, the woman of Africa succumbs to a rivalry more artful and more shameful than her own.

To these general tendencies of town life the towns and cities of the Southwest offer no exceptions. As one passes beyond the coast belt of Texas, the proportion of negroes rapidly lessens, but their preference for the town over the country is even more marked than it is to the eastward. The planters declare that it is impossible to hold them on the plantations. Yet in the towns it is said that the majority of them subsist on the earnings of a small minority who are at work, the women doing more than their part, chiefly as servants and laundresses. For the coming of white men into manual employments is even more marked in Texas than in the older Southern States. As a rule, they control the city trades completely. In Houston, for instance, it is said that the unions would not stop at force and violence if the negroes offered them any troublesome competition.

That, however, is not the situation in most Southern cities. As a rule, the relation of the trades-unions to the race question is quite different; and the writer must confess that the forces engaged in this particular quarter of the field have aligned themselves in a way which to him was altogether surprising. His expectation was that, sooner or later, the negro being excluded from the unions, the race prejudice would reinforce the union man's hatred of the scab, and the labor question would thus take on in the South a character more savage and dangerous than it has ever had in the North. But in this forecast something in the human nature of one or the other race, or of both, was overlooked. The negroes have never ventured into any serious rivalry with the white unions. They do, it is true, form unions among themselves, which are, as it is said, "affiliated" with those of the whites. But what this means in practice is that both unions are controlled by white men. Even when the whites in a particular trade or a particular establishment are only a minority, they have their way. Negroes rarely or never offer to take the place of white men who strike or are locked out. The explanation doubtless is

that, with good reason, they fear white men of the working class worse than they fear employers and capitalists, who frequently belong to the class so often described as the natural protectors of the blacks. It seems to be a fact that white working-men from the North are more bitterly opposed to sharing any occupation with negroes than the native whites are. However, the situation in the Southwest may indicate that when the whites have sufficient numbers to monopolize the city trades they will incline to exclude negroes altogether.

All these things might be true of the towns, and the negro might still be reasonably safe if in the country his place were secure. Southern civilization is still markedly rural. The country still greatly outweighs the town in wealth and in population.

But there is much in the country to strengthen the general inference one naturally makes from what appears in the towns. In the country, also, white men are doing more and more of the work that was formerly left to negroes.

This is particularly true of those parts of Virginia and the Carolinas whence the negroes are migrating Northward so steadily. There are even instances, in those quarters, of large planters and landowners who now make it a rule to have neither negro laborers nor negro tenants, aiming especially to guard against sudden departures. Wherever the new régime has been thus candidly accepted, it seems unlikely that the old will ever be restored. Once free of their long dependence on the African, these people will hardly go back to it of their own accord.

But it is still more important, in any forecast of the future, that one finds a tendency to displace the negro farm-hand and the negro tenant in regions where it cannot be attributed to a voluntary withdrawal of the negroes. If it were not so, one might incline to explain the general invasion of manual employments by white people on the ground of mere necessity, since there is more work to do nowadays than ever before in the South, and relatively fewer negroes to do it. The tendency does appear, however, in quarters where the negroes are increasing, increasing by migration, increasing faster than the whites. It is observable in such strongholds of the African laborer as the Black Belt of Georgia and Alabama, the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta, the valley of the Brazos in Texas.

It is not, in these quarters, the native poor white with whom

the negro has to reckon. The up-country people, though they are coming into the towns, show little disposition to invade the prairies and the river-bottoms. It is the European, sometimes the German, but oftener the peasant of Southern Europe, particularly the Italian and the Bohemian, whose competition the negro of the cotton and rice and sugar belts, if he were wise, would now be learning to fear. In Texas, he encounters the Mexican also; and, here and there, one hears talk of trying Chinese coolies. But the real threat is from the South of Europe.

Unfortunately, we do not know the proportions of this immigration into the South; but after a survey of the field I am sure that it is already considerable, and the signs are that it is also fast increasing. That is the opinion of railroad and steamship officials and of immigration agents. Even in the towns, effects of it are easily discernible. At least one great railroad system has begun to use Italians instead of negroes for track work, as is done so commonly in the North. The newcomers are also finding their way into mills and factories. But nothing will impress so deeply any one familiar with the life of the Lower South as their appearance in the sugar-fields, the rice-fields, and the cotton-fields.

To understand how the inroad has been made and what it may conceivably herald, it is necessary to understand what the present-day plantation of the Lower South is like. A series of changes have transformed it into a very different affair from what it was under slavery, and for some years after the war. In place of the old-time planter, there is now a landlord. In place of the slave or the hired laborer, there is a tenant: sometimes a "cash tenant," paying a fixed money rental, but oftener a "share tenant," paying his rent with a part of the crop. Instead of a single and single-headed patriarchal community, there are a number of little farms under one ownership. It is true that the landlord retains, occasionally by contract, universally by custom, many of the rights of supervision and control which he had as a planter. He or his overseer is constantly inspecting, advising—in effect, commanding. He usually keeps in his own hands the fencing and draining and general up-keep of his land. It is more than likely that he advances the tenants their supplies. He may even own the tenant's tools and stock, as well as his cabin. Sometimes his control is so nearly complete that it might be more correct to describe the division of the

crop as a payment by him to the tenant for his services, than as a payment by the tenant to him for the land. Of course, there is also the small independent farmer, white or black. But the share-tenant plantation is the typical agricultural community of the Cotton Belt.

One of the earliest attempts to introduce the peasant of Southern Europe into this system was made twelve years ago, by the late Mr. Austin Corbin, at Sunnyside Plantation, on the Arkansas side of the Mississippi River. A colony of Italians was brought over, and established in tenantry under contracts which looked to the final purchase of their holdings. Mr. Corbin died, however, before the enterprise was well under way. The men in charge of it were not, it is understood, familiar with local conditions or experienced in plantation management. As first planned and conducted, it failed. But with the failure came a change. Men to the manner born were put in charge. It can be stated to-day, on the best authority, that the experiment of tenant-farming with Italians at Sunnyside is successful from the point of view of the managers and owners, brilliantly successful from the point of view of the immigrants themselves. They have mastered quickly what they had to learn about the growing of cotton and the other crops. They have endured the climate. They have proved both more industrious and more thrifty than the negroes about them. Though they began with nothing, a number now own the land they cultivate. Several have bank-accounts running into the thousands. Some are sending money home to pay debts or to bring over their kin.

It is probable that the Sunnyside colony was selected with some care, and from the thrifty peasant farmers of the interior of Italy. Quite likely, therefore, these people are superior to the mass of Italian emigrants to this country, drawn mainly from Sicily and the lower end of the Peninsula. But what has happened at Sunnyside is happening at too many other places to be regarded any longer as extraordinary. One instance is carefully described in a Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor.* At Calumet, a sugar-plantation in Louisiana, none but negro labor was employed up to eight years ago. Since then there has been a gradual displacement of the negroes by Italians. It does not appear that either there or at Sunnyside the blacks are stimulated

* No. 38. "The Negroes of Cinclare and Calumet." By J. B. Laws.

by the example and competition of the newcomers to work harder or to save money. It is found, too, that more Italian than negro children work in the fields, and at harder labor. I have heard of Italian tenants who, after harvesting their own crops, have hired themselves as cotton-pickers to negro tenants who were behindhand. It has come to be a common saying, where the ways of both races are known, that if an Italian earns a dollar and a quarter he will spend the quarter and save the dollar, but that if a negro earns the same amount he will spend—a dollar and a half.*

The Italian as laborer and tenant on the plantation of the Lower South is no longer an experiment. It is clear that as a rule he does the work at least as well as the negro, and that he is more likely to save money and become a landowner. The testimony concerning Bohemians is quite as favorable. The success of the large German colonies in Texas, Alabama, and other parts of the South has long been established. Yet it is true that many planters, probably a majority, still prefer the negro, and particularly the uneducated negro, both as laborer and as tenant.

Explanations, however, are not far to seek. There is custom, tradition, prejudice. There is, in most cases, a genuine fondness for negroes. There is the habit of command, to which the negro makes the least resistance. Moreover, by the system of advances, the planter can be reasonably sure of obtaining from negro tenants what are called "speculative profits," that is to say, interest on advances. The Italian tenant very soon saves enough to do without advances. Though the negro may be always in debt, he rarely fails, in the long run, to pay; and he is usually too poor a trader to get the best of a bargain—which the Italian frequently does. These considerations may for some time operate to keep the negro in the plantation system. But they will not suffice to keep the invaders out. For all over the South the demand for tenants and farm laborers outruns the supply.

This is, I know, but a scattering and incomplete arrayal of the

* Italian emigration to the South seems at present to be entering on a new phase. Acting for the Italian government, Il Cavaliere A. Rossi and G. Rossati and Professor A. Ravaioli have been carefully studying the opportunities which various sections hold out to their countrymen, particularly to agriculturists. Their reports are so favorable to parts of the Southern States that Baron Mayor des Planches, the Italian Ambassador, has heartily endorsed an organized movement to turn Italians in that direction. I wish there were space to use the information concerning this most interesting enterprise which Baron Mayor has kindly placed at my disposal.

observations which have convinced me that the large province the negro has always held in the industry of the Southern States is now being formidably invaded. I think, however, that enough has been given to show that his place in the South's industrial system can no longer be regarded as secure. Five years ago, Principal Washington declared that the next twenty years were going to be the most serious in the history of his race. "Within this period," he said, "it will be largely decided whether the negro will be able to retain the hold which he now has upon the industries of the South, or whether his place will be filled by white people from a distance." The wisdom of the forecast is already proved; yet it neglected the native poor white.

All that I have said has been by way of showing that the negro has lost ground. But without his losing some ground no invasion could have occurred; and to say that it has occurred is not to say that he cannot resist it. Principal Washington is himself still undismayed. The apparent loss is, he holds, rather relative than absolute; it is largely explained by the South's rapid development and the gains of the whites in mere numbers. He is also cheered by the entrance of negroes into higher and higher employments, such as clerkships, stenography, and various branches of "business." My belief is, however, that it is nearly always mulattoes who rise in the industrial scale. It is probable, too, that the negroes have the same doubtful advantage that women have when they offer for the work of men. They will accept lower wages.

It is in trying to determine how much ground the negro has lost that we turn most naturally to the statisticians. Unfortunately, the census-gatherers leave unasked many questions we should like to see answered; and some of the changes I have been describing are so recent that the returns of five years ago may have been but little affected by them. All that has been said of the townward movement among both races, and of the Northward movement of the negroes is, however, sufficiently confirmed. But it is the tables dealing with occupations which seem most apposite. I shall not attempt to analyze them. It is safer to rest on the careful inferences of the experts.* It should be explained that the term

* The bulk of the Report is the work of Professor Walter F. Willcox, of Cornell University, doubtless the first authority in the country on statistics concerning negroes. Professor Dubois, of Atlanta University, in his chapter on "The Negro Farmer," is not less rigidly scientific.

"negroes," as used in the returns, covers all races other than the white. For the South, however, the error involved in the failure to distinguish among colored peoples cannot be great.

In 1900, more than two-thirds of all the negroes engaged in remunerative occupations in the Southern States were in the three classes described as "laborers," "agricultural laborers," and "farmers, planters, and overseers." Within the decade, the number of negro "laborers" had increased by more than 60 per cent., the "agricultural laborers" by 22.3 per cent., the "farmers, planters, and overseers" by 31.1 per cent. The increase in the first class does not look hopeful, but the boundary lines between the three classes are so vague and shifting that reasoning about them from the tables is discouraged. The same difficulty is found with certain other classes. There are also certain occupations, such as teaching and the Christian ministry, in which there is no appreciable competition between the races. In yet a third group, including such large classes as the hostlers, the masons, and the porters and helpers in stores, no figures by races for the Southern States alone were given in 1890. It appears, however, that in the case of at least fourteen leading occupations the figures for the two census years reveal the true course of an actual competition.

In five of those occupations, while both races gained, the negroes gained more rapidly than the whites. This was true of the class known as "servants and waiters," of the miners and quarrymen, of the nurses and midwives, of the iron and steel workers, and of the operatives in sawmills and planing-mills. In the other nine occupations, the negroes lost ground relatively to the whites. That is to say, the proportion of negroes among the draymen, truckmen and teamsters in the South, among the steam-railroad employees, among the operatives in tobacco and cigar factories, among the fishermen and oystermen, among the engineers and firemen of other than locomotive engines, among the barbers and hair-dressers, among the launderers and laundresses, among the seamstresses, and among the carpenters and joiners, was less in 1900 than it was in 1890. In the two classes last named, there was an absolute decrease in the number of negroes. The figures for the whole country show also that there were fewer negro blacksmiths in 1900 than in 1890; and there is no reason to suppose that what was true of the whole country was not true of the Southern States.

The census tables, therefore, strengthen rather than weaken the inference from actual observation. So far as they throw any light at all on the inquiry, they indicate that five years ago the negroes were losing rather than gaining ground in the industries of the South. It is disappointing that they do not yield more positive inferences concerning the great group of occupations covered by the general term "agriculture." We have, however, in the annual assessment lists of several Southern States which take account of the race to which each taxpayer belongs, some fairly safe material for an estimate of the negro's place in the greatest of Southern industries.

The Georgia assessments have been closely studied, and they seem to show that in the matter of acquiring land the negroes of that State are not now progressing as fast as they were at an earlier period of their history as freemen. In 1874, the negroes of Georgia owned, all together, more than a third of a million acres. In seven years from that date, the amount was doubled. Ten years later, in 1891, the total passed a million acres. But at the end of the next decade there was practically no increase at all. The figures for the total wealth of the Georgia negroes, from year to year, parallel closely the figures for land alone. There is an increase, gradual, but not constant, up to the early nineties; but for the next decade a slight positive decrease. However, it appears that the wealth of the white people of Georgia also declined in the nineties. It cannot be said, therefore, that negroes have been falling behind in the accumulation of property in general. But it is not clear that their failure to go on acquiring land is accounted for by the general shrinkage in values revealed by the assessments.

Moreover, they are in no position to be content with merely holding their own. Their own in Georgia is less than three per cent. of all the land included in farms, and but little more than three per cent. of the total wealth—and they are nearly half the population. True, they began only forty years ago, and with nothing. But the whites also were at that time wofully impoverished. Is it reasonable to suppose that the disparity would now be nearly so great as it is if the two races were of equal capacity for accumulation? If the disparity does not rapidly grow less, can it be contended that the negro is proving his case as a freeman, as an American?

For that, after all, in our commercial, industrial democracy, is the supreme test by which the negro's future on the American continent will be determined. The change which, if my observation is not egregiously at fault, is now coming over the industries of the South, is not merely an invasion of the negro's occupations. It is, rather, a change of standards of efficiency in work; and the negro's hope of rising, his chance of even holding his own, depends on his ability to live up to the new standard. With the increase of population, and a keener and keener struggle for wealth, the standard of industry, of skill, and of thrift will approximate more and more closely that of the Northern States and of the West of Europe. The white man whom the negro has to fear is no longer the man who would force him to work. It is the man who would take his work away from him. The danger, the immediate menace, is from rivalry rather than oppression.

But this is not to say that oppression, past and present, has nothing to do with the situation. The social and political status of the negro must certainly be considered. If it were different, his showing in industry might also be different. Some, no doubt, will hold that the characteristics which handicap him most heavily in the struggle are those he got from slavery. That opinion, however, is not so common as it used to be. It is now freely conceded, even by leading negroes, that the training of slavery may have been as good a preparation for the race's present opportunities as any that this unregulated world of men could ever conceivably have vouchsafed it. The negroes of America were in this way immeasurably advanced beyond the competence of their fellows in Africa. Nine Southern employers out of ten will still declare that they prefer the laborer who has been a slave to the younger representatives of freedom. No doubt, an exception must be made of the graduates of schools like Hampton and Tuskeegee. The testimony of those who know at first hand the work and the lives of these young men and young women is almost uniformly favorable. They are, however, but a little leaven in so great a mass. They cannot be treated as representatives, for, apart from their exceptional training, they may be said to have been, in a sense, selected.

But whatever we may decide about the effects of slavery, it is clear, I think, that the denials which they endure under the caste system work, on the whole, unfavorably to the negroes in the

struggle for wealth. The sum of the matter seems to be that life does not offer to them the same inducements to endeavor which it offers to the white men about them. In the struggle for the things of this world, the negro is not lured on, as the white man is, by the vision of the kingdoms of this world, and the glory of them. It is a common and no doubt a correct observation that he is weak in the desire and purpose of self-betterment. But desire is generally in some degree proportioned to its objects, and purpose to its opportunities. Black men, I suppose, cannot help feeling that what they can win from life is always short of what they might win if they were white. I do not believe that the mass of them are agonized with the sense of denial quite as white men would be in their place. But may not the sting of it be keenest in those very men and women who, because they aspire most, must be counted on to do the most to lift up themselves and their fellows? The caste arrangement which has succeeded slavery is of necessity, in some measure, deadening to ambition. On the other hand, it does not give the white man, as slavery did, the power, and the individually selfish motive, to make the negro work.

It has, no doubt, its compensations. There is sense in saying that to exclude the negro from politics was a good way to get him to work. He, like other human beings, probably works at times for the mere reason that there is nothing else in particular to do. It is also quite probably true that in his present stage he works best, as he fights best, under the eyes of those he looks to as superiors. Perhaps, from his low place in the social system, he exaggerates the happiness he would have in a higher, somewhat as the ignorant exaggerate the advantages of being learned. Possibly, if he were made in all things the white man's equal, he would lapse from those Caucasian ideals which attract him from above. But all these advantages of his being underneath, real as they may be, are, I think, more than offset by the practical uses white men may make of their superior station and their control over all branches of government. In the courts of law, for instance, it is said that the property rights of the negro are protected quite as well as the white man's; but this is not true of his person, of his life. The negro assailant of a white man rarely escapes his punishment; the white assailant of a negro far too frequently does. Moreover, in all business dealings, selfishness is to be pre-

sumed. If white men, in their business dealings with negroes, never stoop to profit by their ascendency through caste, then human nature has been sadly maligned.

It must, I think, be admitted that the competition is unequal. But it does not help the negro to dwell on the handicap he carries, whether from the past fact of slavery or the present fact of caste. Even if it should prove true that the heaviest handicap of all is his distinctly racial characteristics, entirely apart from his history in America, he might be no better off for admitting it. A wiser Godspeed is to tell him that his best chance, if not, indeed, his sole chance, of lifting himself, socially and politically, is precisely the chance he has of winning in the competition which is now being forced upon him. If he would strive for the best place he can have in our American life, the way to it lies through work and saving.

The misery of all our debating about him is that we cannot honestly pretend to be glad that he is here, or to desire that his seed shall increase. Yet surely we can afford the honesty of telling him the truth. Let us tell him, at least, that it is idle to put his faith in party platforms or laws of Congress or amendments to the Constitution. Let us tell him that if he would have the white man's ballot or the white man's culture, if he would exact from white men, across the line of caste, fair dealing and considerate treatment, he must learn to match the white man's industry, his shrewdness, his forethought of the morrow. Were the admonition harsher, it would be more sincere. If he would keep the foothold he has now among us, if he would survive and live, and look to see his children live after him, he must put money in his purse.

WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

NIETZSCHE AND THE "WILL TO POWER."

BY VERNON LEE.

THE fact that Friedrich Nietzsche, when released from life at only fifty-six, had already survived his reasonable soul by nearly eleven years, disposes of his philosophy with miraculous satisfactoriness for some of his opponents. But it is liable to make those feel almost abashed who do not relish such cheap irony on the part of Fate.

I wish to make it plain, therefore, that, though the final catastrophe of this great mind appears to me to have had constitutional causes and preliminary symptoms which affected the doomed man's manner of being and therefore of thinking, yet it is my conviction that the psychological interest and moral importance of what, following his own example, I venture to designate as "the Case of Nietzsche" would have been quite as real, though less vulgarly obvious, had it never been rounded off by so frightful a logico-dramatic coincidence. If, therefore, I proceed to deal with Nietzsche's philosophy as the expression of spiritual and bodily unhealthiness, let it be understood that I am referring only to the kind of madness which Nietzsche's Wise Man prayed for—"Give me, ye Powers, madness, that I may believe in myself!"—and not at all to the miserable obliteration of mind with which an atrocious and stupid destiny was preparing to answer that prayer. For it is with this "madness that he might believe in himself" that I intend to deal in the following pages.

The soundest and, therefore, the most living and fertile part of a philosopher's work is, perhaps, that which makes him not unlike, but like, his fellows; nay the possibility of being assimilated by the future is, in many cases, in direct proportion to the fact of having been assimilated from the past. But my object, in the present study, has not been the extracting of what I consider the

most valuable productions of Nietzsche's extraordinary mind; all the various "selections, philosophies and quintessences" of Nietzsche are amply sufficient in their unintentional misrepresentation of him as a typically sane, sound and socially normal thinker. My object has been, on the contrary, to collect into a synthetic group those peculiarities which differentiate him from nearly all other equally great thinkers; peculiarities which bring him into conflict, not merely, as he gloried in feeling, with the mental habits of hypocrites, Philistines and decadents, but with the modes of thinking and feeling indispensable for the continuance of the human race, and as such deeply ingrained in the human race's composition. I desire, in short, to see what was at the bottom of Nietzsche's characteristic views of life, in order to judge whether life is likely to cultivate or to weed out this type of philosophy and this type of philosopher.

"There is no Will to Existence," says Zarathustra; "for what does not yet exist, cannot will; and, as to that which does exist, how could it possibly will to exist?"

Besides a combination of a truism ("that which does not exist, cannot will") with an entirely unproven assumption ("that which does exist cannot will to exist"), we have here a confusion between an abstract, metaphorical statement and an individual concrete fact. Philosophically speaking, no one has ever attributed to the individual human being dominant, unfailing desire for continued existence, so that its denial cannot be the core of Zarathustra's supreme discovery; and we must look for that in the denial of that metaphorical Will under which the genius of Schopenhauer adumbrated the great generalizations of modern biology. The necessity of growing, reproducing, varying, adapting, of surviving at any price, this, and this only, can be called the Will to Existence. But this is an abstraction, an allegory, though a perfectly fitting one, and the Will to Existence can be postulated, and has been postulated, only of that abstract and allegorical entity, the Species. For this Will to Existence Nietzsche, in probably conscious contradiction to his discarded master, tries therefore to substitute a Will to Power; and the form of speech renders such a substitution superficially possible; Will is will, and you need only write "Power" after effacing "Existence." But this operation is a delusion or a piece of trickery, an attempt at exchanging things which do not belong to the same category.

Looking at that abstraction called "the Species," and expressing our generalizations about it under the metaphorical form of Will, we are struck immediately by the utter indifference manifested by the Species to any such relation as is implied by the word "Power"; and by the metaphorical readiness which the Species displays, on the contrary, for proceedings absolutely negatived by the word "Power": a readiness to alter, to dwindle, to lie low, to degenerate, to submit to any tyranny, privation or parasitic condition, or even to self-mutilation, rather than allow itself to die. Indeed, the survival through self-effacement, as distinguished from self-assertion (and power implies self-assertion), is so frequent an occurrence in the life of Species, that I cannot read Nietzsche's description of the methods towards survival attributed by him to primitive Christian communities, without thinking of some naturalist's account of a sort of animal which, after living in decent independence on land or in water, has got itself imprisoned, by the ruthless Will to Existence, in the diseased body of some more powerful kind of creature. So that, if Zarathustra meant to replace Schopenhauer's great Will, the Will to Existence, tingling (as we seem to feel it) throughout the universe, by his more "*vornehm*" Will to Power, he must take back his remark; for Nature cares nothing for his new scale of values.

Nor is this all. The Will to Power may and does exist as an individual phenomenon. But (and here we begin our real examination of Nietzsche's views in reference to that very "Life," which he thought he so aristocratically accepted), whatever exists in the individual is, speaking metaphorically, yet very correctly, subject to the Will of the Species; and the Will of the Species is, as we have seen, the mere Will to Existence. Like any other peculiarity, the Will to Power develops so long as it conduces to survival, and atrophies to the extent to which it becomes a danger.

Thus the Will to Existence, of which, as of all other divinities, the exclusive pride of Nietzsche would not brook the reality, shows itself to be a god of most ruthless practicality, and every other kind of volition, every instinct, habit or tendency of living creatures, all the *demiurgi*, Olympian or subterranean, can hold their sway only at its inexorable behest.

Translated into prosaic literalness, the question may therefore be stated as follows: Does the predominance of self-consciousness

and the assertion of the ego, which, taken together, constitute Nietzsche's Will to Power, offer such advantages to the human race as to have fostered this Will to Power to an exorbitant degree in the past, or as to foster it, so far as we can foresee, to still completer supremacy in the future? We may get an approximate answer to this question in the course of examining some of the mental and emotional tendencies and habits which Nietzsche condemns in mankind, as the unworthy rivals to the Will to Power, and perhaps arrive at some conclusion by subsequently glancing also at the position which Nietzsche takes up towards life as a whole, that is to say, towards that Will to Existence of which he so rudely denies the existence.

First and foremost among the opponents to the Will to Power is what we may roughly sum up as Duty. Conspicuous among the prophecies of Zarathustra are those concerning the great Lion from out of the desert, who fights and destroys the great Dragon whose wings are inscribed with commandments. "Thou Shalt" is the name of the great Dragon, but the spirit of the Lion says, "I Will." While busy demolishing the Free Will of Christian and of Kantian ethics, Nietzsche had himself made a superb demonstration of the fundamental identity of that Lion "I Will" and that Dragon "Thou Shalt"; or, rather, he had shown that neither the Lion nor the Dragon had any kind of real existence. But, taken upon the plane of the illusion inevitable in our feeling, such a seeming division and opposition between the inner and the outer Will can and must be recognized; and Nietzsche could legitimately split up the chimæra, Free Will, into the solitary, rebellious Lion and the obsequious, Philistine Dragon. But, if we are to discuss not the metaphysics of Free Will, but the phenomenon of apparent alternative as manifest in experience, the question of *Thou Shalt* and *I Will* takes a different aspect. There is more than a rough and ready practicality (*"pour encourager les autres,"* like Voltaire's court martial on Admiral Byng) in the legal limitation of responsibility to such individuals as are neither idiots nor maniacs. For, as the appearance of volition exists only in the face of two conceivable modes of action, which imply Consciousness, there can be no will, no choice, in cases where the instincts have the blind, automatic action of reflexes. There is, therefore, a greater appearance of volition in obeying a law and conforming to a standard than in acting under the undivided pres-

sure of a habit or an appetite. Nietzsche was thoroughly aware of all this, and had, moreover, the proud and combative and self-centred man's excessive and unphilosophical scorn for anything like habits, blind instincts and reflexes. He therefore formulated (I was going to write: "he was therefore *obliged* to formulate," but these are words he never would have admitted with reference to himself) something opposed to obscure instinctive preferences, but opposed also to all categorical imperatives: an individual standard and law (including pretended subversion of all previous standards and laws), a private categorical imperative so rigid that slavery, degradation, Dantesque dung-ponds of ignominy, were the ineluctable punishment of their non-recognition; let alone, of course, a fine preliminary bout of Zarathustrian philosophizing on them "with the hammer."

Thus Nietzsche was never able to carry his individualism (as his predecessor Stirner had done) to its logical conclusion of anarchy inside as well as outside the individual. He committed the inconsequence (to which we owe some of his most beautiful and perhaps immortal sentences) of preaching the most rigorous hierarchy, and hierarchic commanding and obeying, within the soul of the lawbreaker himself. I call this an inconsequence, and hope to demonstrate that it was one; fruitful, moreover, like many of the inconsequences of one-sided thinkers. Nietzsche, of course, asserted that this régime of categorical imperatives was the outcome, solely, of the individual himself; and that the Zarathustrian person (to say nothing of the eventually coming "Über-Mensch") went through this noviciate of purifications, professed this *rule* of vigils and chastenings (so singular in a theoretic opponent of asceticism) for the simple gratification of his own fine gentleman's *taste*. But, if we look at facts, this superlative Zarathustrian "good form" (for as such this moral Beau Brummell gives it us) is, like every other kind of *good form*, a product for which no isolated individuality could suffice, and for which no pressure of merely individual preference could originally account. It is essentially an historical, sociological product. Intent upon his own moral posturings and gestures (in which the old Stoical mantle and even sundry Christian *academic* properties, were unconsciously made use of), Nietzsche found it convenient to take for granted the ready-made Zarathustrian individual, attitudes, gestures, good taste and all; and therefore averted his glance from

the genesis and evolution thereof. For, in that genesis and evolution of Zarathustra's "good taste," the principal part had been played throughout the centuries by that which Nietzsche most furiously disliked (reserving it to explain only the Socratic, Christian, Kantian or other unclean spirits)—namely, the race at large, the instincts, claims and habits of the majority of human beings so utterly offensive to Nietzsche's sense of smell and somewhat queasy stomach. And, in a way, Nietzsche actually placed himself in the impossibility of denying such villainous origin, which a thoroughpaced anarchic thinker like Stirner would have made short work of, together with formulas, standards and good taste of any kind.

Nietzsche, as was inevitable in one who frankly objected to gods of all sorts—because, "if there were gods, how could he have endured not being one of them?"—Nietzsche, filling up his own horizon, had pretty well sent Nature (and the Will to Existence) to the Coventry of the Lucretian gods, and very rarely referred to her or it. But the possession of the finest taste unfortunately requires, not merely recognition, but a standard; and thus the isolated superfine individual was betrayed into calling on Nature's testimony to the correctness of his moral attitude and manner. "All the audacity, the fineness and keenness that have ever existed," he writes, "all the masterly certainty and dancelike spirit, have developed themselves, thanks to the tyranny of such self-imposed law *(Willkür-Gesetze)* and it is by no means improbable that just this, and not a system of *laissez-aller,* is *nature* and *natural.*" Nietzsche did not know how large a door he was opening in this second part of the sentence: a door, a gate, through which what should sweep in but that deposed, rejected, utterly banished Will to Existence? For, if the individual has not grown as a mere random jumble of uncoordinated instincts, this is explained by his not existing as an isolated individual, companionless, *in vacuo.* Man is, more or less, a composite and orderly whole because he is an integral part of a whole which can be only composite and orderly. *Naturalness,* which Nietzsche invoked as a final condemnation of spiritual anarchy, is merely a word for suitability to the ways of other things, adaptation to that great abstract whole which allows insubordinate doings neither in single individuals nor in single instincts. The *law-to-himself* of the finer human being is the expression of a more perfect and well-

nigh automatic adaptation to the hierarchy outside. Nay, far below the sphere of such ethical good form, we find concentric circles of inner coordination, without which we could not move, stand, digest or grow, let alone perceive, feel, think or will. But if there did not exist, if there had not existed for æons, creatures more or less similar around us, if the universe had cared to produce only isolated higher individuals, or Super-Men, would there have been a need for such a complex form of life; a need for reactions, so intricate and so subordinate to one another; a need for perception, will or thought; an opening, so to speak, for such superfine moral manners?

After the great Dragon, Duty, let us pass on to the consideration of what Nietzsche regards as the vilest of all small moral worms: Humility. The word "worm" is appropriate; for Nietzsche derives its origin from the practical wisdom of rolling up and shamming death in order to avoid a second crushing. Granted, as is very possible, that such is its real genealogy, there comes the question, why Nature (for even Nietzsche has unwillingly to admit that there is Nature) should have preserved this particular ditch-begotten little virtue. The answer is, simply, that Humility happens to afford an excellent corrective for a particular optical illusion to which the human being, Mensch or Über-Mensch, is condemned (with danger to his comfort and even his existence), by a trifling peculiarity of his constitution. I am alluding, of course, to the fact that we, all of us, happen to be enclosed in our own skin, and are therefore aware of our own existence in a more direct, intimate and forcible manner than of the existence of others. Those others, meanwhile, similarly enclosed, are afflicted by the selfsame unevenness of perception: the inside, namely oneself, is thoroughly visible, audible, intelligible and imperative; the outside, or not-oneself, becomes an accessory or background, and tends perpetually to vanish altogether. The virtue or vice of Humility serves to reverse, in part, this natural, but by no means objectively correct, perspective; and thereby tends to diminish the wear and tear, nay, the sometimes fatal accidents, which it must otherwise occasion. The fact of being what house-agents call "self containing," makes us, each and all, the most important thing we can conceive. Humility whispers that, on the contrary, we are very probably by far the most unimportant thing in all the universe, and thereby halves our natural

pretensions to something nearer our objective bulk and power. In this manner it enables us to find room to stand in, to thread our way among those too-too solid ghosts, our fellow men, to exchange place, to move, to expand even—in short, to live. This is the service rendered by Humility, and this is why Humility has been fostered by the racial Will to Existence, by the great *demiurgus,* Life, who shuts his eyes to baseness of origin and primæval worm-wriggling; Life, well aware that, if the haughty genealogist went far enough in his researches, he would find wrigglings of some kind, and animals less aristocratic than worms, in the first chapter of the most distinguished family histories.

The reason why Life can be less squeamish than Nietzsche, and yet, somehow, maintain a certain æsthetic dignity and have as grand an air as any Zarathustra brandishing his Will to Power, is that Life possesses the secret of great transmutations, transfigurations, of which Nietzsche gradually lost the very conception. After Humility, Compassion is, in his eyes, the vilest and most vicious of Christian virtues. Sickness, weakness, says Nietzsche, requires only one thing, to be cleared away. That depends, common sense has avowed for centuries, in fact for æons, how sick the sick, how weak the weak. It is the strength of the weak man, the healthiness of the organs still free from disease, to which Compassion addresses itself, and which, with help and time, effects survival and recovery. Nay, what we look upon as symptoms of disease, or as faintings and failings of weakness, are frequently, in the moral order as well as the bodily, adaptations to a difficult crisis, diminished claims, nay, even inverted instincts, fostered by the great Will to Existence. Take the Imitation of Christ, that almost complete, perhaps because almost posthumous, manifesto of the millenarian and ascetic and self-humiliating sides of Christianity. To us, particularly to us when in health and prosperity, it may have a taste which is mawkish, a taste of physic, if not of poison; but for centuries it was, and in individual cases (till wisdom and gentleness invent a better compound) it still remains a pain-killer, a sleeping-draught which has saved from death or from madness. Christianity as defined by Nietzsche—that is to say, Christianity in its most questionable and perishable aspect—constituted, after all, only one of the many *modus vivendi* which the race made for itself at various stages of its difficult existence: regimens of brutality and narrow-mindedness or of self-suppres-

sion and mystic stultification, Spartan, early Aryan, early Hebraic, Buddhist, Christian—all representing a mutilation or a narcotizing of some one of the soul's possibilities; each of them furnishing, in its turn, a balance of desirable effects over effects undesirable or actually pernicious. Looked at dispassionately, there is no grosser falsehood in the notion that the individual ego is necessarily sinful, than in the notion that the individual tribe or caste or race is necessarily impeccable; nor is it more lopsided to give unto others what would be best employed by oneself, than to take away from others what might best be employed by them. Indeed, one may ask oneself whether Tolstoy, let us say, is really less of a human being, if he is really more warped and maimed, more of a cripple and a monster than—well, than Nietzsche.

Let us leave the ground of human duty and virtue, and pass on, "Beyond Good and Evil," to that which Nietzsche considered the only real one: the ground of human greatness. What did Nietzsche make of the Human Work? The *work,* which is the test and the reason of Carlyle's Hero and of Renan's Prospero-Sage, had no intrinsic interest in Nietzsche's eyes, no place in his philosophy. Its importance for him was merely as an expression of what he very erroneously took it to be, the outcome of an individual temperament, the manifestation of a Will to Power. Now, Nietzsche did not really want any Will to Power except his own, and he had a positively morbid dislike to coming in contact with other people's temperament. It is understating the case to say that nineteen out of every twenty references he makes to the work of other men are expressions of aversion, contempt or disgust; and it is no mere coincidence that his ideal, Zarathustra, in all we are told about his life, preaches, reviles, laughs, dances, nay, even lets himself once or twice be lured into the deadly sin of pity, but on no single occasion extracts pleasure or profit from any other human being or any human being's work. The assimilation of other men's greatness, the enriching oneself by appreciation, is never mentioned as part of the processes of growth of the great man, of the Super-Man. His relations, when not of scorn and destruction, are entirely confined to his own solitary person; he develops merely by wrestling with himself and by expressing himself; he remains (even if multiplied to a possible race of Super-Men) not merely isolated and solitary, but virtually alone in the universe; a colossal Michelangelesque figure, with immense sinews

and rather academic draperies, filling up a narrow background entirely devoid of vegetation, houses, or any incident except two or three symbolical animals; he stands or, as Nietzsche represents him, he dances, in a dignified manner though a dreary one; and, when he is not inveighing against the sickening peculiarities of the human race he has turned his back upon, he is engaged in the one act for which he specially exists. The Super-Man says "'Yes' to life." But, before inquiring into the precise nature of this "'Yes' to life," let us forestall all possibility of its being mistaken for any kind of philosophic or poetical act of contemplation of life's loveliness or mystery. The more so that we shall incidentally gain some further, and some terribly significant, insight into the temperament with which Nietzsche himself had to face life. Here is his "genesis" of the *Vita Contemplativa:*

"In primitive times, the individual, conscious of his own strength, is busy translating his feelings and thoughts *(Vorstellungen)* into acts, as in hunting, robbing, aggression, ill-usage and murder, without counting such fainter imitations of such proceedings as he finds tolerated within his own community." (Here I must open a parenthesis to remark upon the utter overlooking by Nietzsche of an activity which must necessarily have been enormously developed in primitive times, the activity of invention and manual dexterity.) "But if his vigor diminish," proceeds Nietzsche in his account of the primæval man, "if he feel tired or sick or depressed or oversatiated, and therefore momentarily delivered of desire, then he becomes a comparatively better, that is to say, more harmless, creature. It is in this condition that he becomes a thinker and a reader of the future. But his thoughts, all the products of his mind, must necessarily reflect his momentary condition, that is to say, the beginning of cowardice and fatigue, the diminished importance in his feelings of activity and enjoyment." Let us examine this statement. Nietzsche identifies, quite unwarrantably, the normal satisfaction of appetite with queasy and languid indigestion: according to him, the Berserker at rest must be the sick Berserker. Nietzsche has no recognition of the obvious fact that, in the healthy creature, the satisfaction of a want does not in the least mean the exhaustion of an energy (he sophistically or perhaps merely characteristically, *autobiographically,* identifies desire for objects with desire for action), and that, shelter, food, the first necessaries once obtained, this energy will be at liberty,

will go into other things, useful inventions, mechanical work, and, those having given their result, into the superfluous pleasantness of play, art and thought. Nietzsche is even guilty of self-contradiction. He certainly seems to consider activity as due to a desire for asserting power; yet he supposes activity to flag with the satisfaction of definite material wants. However this be, he entirely ignores the fact of the transmission to another employment of whatever energy is liberated by the cessation of a want, a fact which is at the root of human history, and explains all the successive complexities of human activity, bodily and mental. But having established the origin of the *Vita Contemplativa,* of thought, imagination, all the higher powers, in the slackness and nausea of the savage weary of violence and sick with surfeit, "*Pudenda origo!*" he has the audacity to exclaim at his own libellous account! Having done this, he continues his attack on the life of the spirit by asserting that men of genius poison normal life by their demand for exceptional moments. "In the same manner," he says, "as we see savages exterminating themselves by the use of alcohol, so mankind as a whole and in its more important qualities *(im ganzen und grossen)* has been slowly but thoroughly corrupted by the spiritual alcoholics of intoxicating feelings, and by the craving therefor. Who knows? Perhaps mankind will even be exterminated thereby."

Thought, sympathetic perception, inventive calculation, imaginative and æsthetic joy, all that spiritual activity which enriches life, enabling it to bring forth more, demanding less weariness and waste, substituting enjoyment which can be shared for enjoyment which must be fought for—all this an alcoholic unfitting mankind to live! Alas, alas! How deep must be the disease which thus converts his fellow creatures' best food into mere poison for this wretched Nietzsche's nerves! "*Pudenda origo!*" one may, indeed, exclaim, not of the spiritual life, but of this man's view of it. We can now understand what Nietzsche's "saying 'Yes' to life" implies, and, incidentally, how it comes to be the culmination of a creed whose basis, as Nietzsche has told us, is "a certain pleasure in saying 'No.'"

According to Nietzsche's belief, under the rubric of the "Eternal Return," every item and every concatenation of items of the universe's existence is bound to repeat itself in cycles of absolutely precise similarity. By this doctrine, therefore, Nietzsche is

enabled (however unconsciously) to withdraw the one ideal and the one consolation which he had apparently conceded to the weakness of all philosophers: the Über-Mensch and his "Yes" will indeed come, have indeed come, an infinity of times already; but the Über-Mensch and his "Yes" also pass, have passed, must pass, and be succeeded by a Da Capo, eternal like his comings and goings, of everything that is not Über-Mensch and not "'Yes' to life." This cosmic fact, as Nietzsche affects to consider it, implies necessarily a return of all those things which the Über-Mensch appeared to have cleared away; indeed, the eight days' illness which the discovery of the Eternal Return cost Zarathustra is very clearly referred to that almost Über-Mensch's recognition of the return—infinitely repeated—of the meanness of spirit, the sympathy and desire for sympathy, the pity and humility, all the slave's-morality of that plebeian civilization which offended the aristocratic Nietzsche by its stuffiness and evil smell. And it is this next to intolerable fact, it is this revolting habit on the part of "Life," to which, above all else, the famous "Yes" of the Super-Man is to be addressed with singing and dancing. The "'Yes' to life," therefore, implies, quite consonantly with all we know of Nietzsche's tendencies, a "No" not merely to all human hope and consolation, but a violent "No" to the assenting Über-Mensch's preferences and wishes. In fact, by an unexpected turn, we find that the "tendency to say 'No,'" the "deliberate ruthlessness" which Nietzsche had attributed to the original thinker, has presented us, at the hands of the denouncer of all asceticism and pessimism, with a new variety of the doctrine of renunciation.

"Not merely," says Nietzsche, "to endure the inevitable, still less to hide it from ourselves . . . *but to love it.*" The thought has never, perhaps, been put in a more striking form; but the thought is old, and it has seen an enormous amount of service, because it has been, on occasion, a very consoling one. It runs through all Stoical literature, descending from the strained but magnificent reasonableness of Epictetus and Aurelius down to a denial of evil, like that of American Faith-Healers; it takes another form, but remains essentially the same, in the Christian notion of Providence and resignation, in all the paraphrases of Dante's "*In la sua voluntade è nostra pace;*" it reappears as Goethe's "*Entbehren sollst du,*" and has even quite recently been dished up, a judicious mixture of Pagan and Christian, by that exquisite

concocter of not very fresh moral and poetic dainties, M. Maeterlinck. And the ubiquitousness, the tenacity, of this doctrine is surely explicable by its belonging, most probably, to a category for which Ibsen has coined a name, to its being, although in the highest and most philosophical sense, a "vital lie"; one of those human inventions for making life's occasional difficulties seem easier: a drug, a tonic, a stimulant or a sedative; not by any means a poison, but very far from being wholesome daily bread. Every form of the doctrine of renunciation, of saying "Yes" to that which naturally provokes a "No," has undoubtedly done great service, and still must do, to mankind; making the human being, if not more fruitful, at all events (upon the whole) less weedy, less parasitic and, in so far, less wasteful of his neighbor's time and his neighbor's strength. But it seems to have the drawback of every lie, even of vital lies, the drawback, crudely, of not corresponding with facts. The facts are that combinations do occur which are dangerous to human life and power, and that pain and the revolt against pain have evolved themselves because they diminish the frequency of such evil combinations.

Sensitiveness to pain and abhorrence thereof are necessary; and, if they require occasional overcoming, it is merely to guard against some greater or more universal evil. It is right, therefore, despite Nietzsche, that there should be pity for others; and right, even more, despite the Stoics, that there should be pity for ourselves. In the real "'Yes' to life" (not Zarathustra's sham one) there must even be implied a "No," instinctive, passionate, even more than reasoned, against such of life's items as are hostile to its completeness and duration.

By all means, therefore, let us play a game of skill and patience with Destiny; turn Fate's moves into gains when we can, and learn from our losses to play better in the future. But let us guard against the temptation, subtle and strong to our inertness and to our vanity, of thinking, or pretending to think, that we can always gain. Making the best of things is intelligent and dignified, it is, above all, practical; but beyond this begins the uncouth folly of depreciating advantages which we must forego or denying reverses which we have to sustain. To say systematically "Yes" to the evils of life would not only break the fruitful continuity of similarity and sympathy, but mar the individual's energy, and jumble the individual's instincts. It would be a poor beginning

for a Super-Man to start with sensibilities so complacent, or illusions so complete, that other men's poison should become his natural meat; and it would condemn him, in the long run, to receive of the life he thus stupidly accepted only the poisonous refuse. 'Tis a poor result of moralizing to affirm that black is white, loss no loss, suffering no suffering; one feels it in all Stoicism from Epictetus down to Maeterlinck, and in all religious mysticism which insists on the goodness of a humanly good God. And if, following Nietzsche's example, we lay ruthlessly analytic hands upon the latest expression of this venerable and indisputable piece of conventional morality, we shall find in the Zarathustrian precept, of "not merely enduring, but loving the inevitable," something worse than the mere weakness and insincerity which is at the bottom of all the other embodiments of this particular "vital lie." For, as the really difficult attitude towards life would be the simple, straightforward one of seeing it lucidly and feeling normally towards it, of hating its evil in proportion as we cherish its good, of continuing in our consciousness the great work of selection with a resolute "No" as well as a resolute "Yes"; as this would evidently be the attitude requiring perhaps almost superhuman strength and displaying almost superhuman dignity, there comes to be an element of positive vulgarity in the swagger of Zarathustra, shouting his "Yes" to the eternally recurring cycle of the universe's intolerable evils. Nay, worse than this; is there not in these Zarathustrian antics of "laughter and dancing" in the face of the most desolating of all nightmare conceptions of the universe, and in this ugly misapplication of the high and happy word "love" to the object of hatred, is there not in all this famous "Yes," a virtual "No" to everything natural, sane in spirit, nay, healthy in body?

Can this be the great gift for which Nietzsche is evermore preparing us? Is it in favor of this that we are told to destroy all long-established systems and valuations? for this that we are to purify the world and our souls by ruthlessness, by "deliberate cruelty" towards others and ourselves? for this that the hills are to be levelled and the valleys raised up by methods of earthquake rather than of engineering? Not in reality. For, more than in any other philosopher, we become aware that there is in Nietzsche's mind something round which his system has grown, but which is far more essential and vital to him than his system: something

continually alluded to, constantly immanent, round which he perpetually hovers, into which he frequently plunges, on whose bank he erects metaphysical edifices, lets off fireworks of epigrams, sets holocausts ablaze and sings magnificent dithyrambs; but which remains undefined, a vague *It*. Such an ineffable central mystery exists in the thought of many philosophers, and perhaps of all mystics (for Nietzsche is a mystic); a whirlpool explaining everything, but never itself explained; called, as the case may be, "Higher Law," "Truth," "Good," sometimes merely "Nature," and, in the remoter Past, most frequently called by the name of "God." It is one of Nietzsche's finest and profoundest achievements that he has, once or twice, called this transcending *It* by a new, surprising and, methinks, a correct name, "My Taste."

In Nietzsche's case, indeed, more perhaps than in that of any other philosopher, the living nucleus of all his teaching is not a thought, but an emotional condition, organic and permanent. Under all the arguments which have grown out of it, under all the facts and theories attracted to it like iron filings to a magnet, out of the refuse of old and the mess of new doctrines, there is, if we look carefully enough, a chronic irritation and throbbing: "I dislike," "I hate," "I am made uncomfortable," "I am incompatible," "I want to get rid," "I want to destroy," "I want to be alone," "I want room for my soreness and swelling." The hypertrophied, hypersensitive ego, which cannot endure the contact of life, the presence of others and other things; the sick ego, in its feverish shiftings and feverish all-overishness, capable of convulsive efforts passing the powers of health, incapable at the same time of the most normal and every-day endurance; such is, I think, the living core of Nietzsche's doctrines. And the various transcending messages he feels that he must bring, the great efforts of destruction and reconstruction he must accomplish, are merely the deli[illegible] birth-throes, they are the massive, yet pervading, pain of a soul which distorts and magnifies all things to the measure of its discomfort. We have seen how his "Will to Power," remaining consciously such, fails to metamorphose itself into those desires for the not-ego, into that striving after the external-to-oneself, into that thinking and feeling of the outside world, which is the process of exteriorization of the subject into the object, normal and necessary in every healthy soul. We have seen similarly how, despite his extraordinary genius, the vastness

of the universe and its complexity and vigor of life entirely escaped Nietzsche, until the world shrank to being little more for him than an inert, almost counterfeit, stage filled up by his own imaginary size and strength; the cooperation of every kind of existence, the give and take of past and present, the ceaseless act of assimilation and reproduction, and their culmination in the immortally living human work, all this accessory, organic, endless and endless complex activity becoming replaced in his mind, by the puny deed of volition of a mere individual Über-Mensch. Nay, we have seen how he gravely asserted that this microscopic human detail could actually accept with a pompous "Yes" the inevitable course of life universal, of which he, his thought and volition, are but as the minutest bubble of froth; and we have seen also how this supposed "'Yes' to life" is in reality, and more than in any of the old ascetic doctrines, a "No" to the most strongly organized preferences and repulsions of the normal soul.

For Nietzsche, through the purely intellectual and often inherited parts of whose work we can trace the thread of that autobiographical philosophy he so greatly prized, gave with unerring truth the formula of his temperament. "A pleasure in saying 'No,' a certain deliberate ruthlessness." The "No," a "No" of his whole unhappy organism, exists not merely in this element of destructiveness; but even more subtly and characteristically in that sense of almost bodily disgust *(Ekel)* which the contact of his fellow men, of their thoughts and feelings, arouses in him, with significant metaphors of "lack of air" and "filthy smell." Even more than that titillation of tearing and breaking perpetually in Nietzsche's fingers, there is the unmistakable evidence of disease in this constant spiritual nausea in Nietzsche's mouth. The two together mean that this man, so splendidly endowed in intellect, was so unhappily constituted as to receive mainly painful impressions from the totality of his surroundings. I think I am justified in saying "mainly painful impressions," despite the occasional praise which Nietzsche bestows upon classic literature, remote Alpine fastnesses, southern clearness and radiance, and more particularly upon certain music — Bizet's, especially, and (partly from contradictoriness to the Wagnerians) Mozart's. For such evidences of pleasure from outer things are not only rare, but they are never fused into any kind of pervading mood of gladness, of appreciation and gratitude towards the outer world. He has, in-

deed, put into words his incapacity of feeling anything save the fewest and most far-between impressions of the goodness of things, and expressed the mass of discontented, depreciating self-assertion in which these rare appreciative impressions were set. For such is the meaning, as indicative of Nietzsche's personality, of that famous phrase about the glance of the true philosopher, "which rarely admires, rarely looks up, rarely loves."

Let us think what that means; and, particularly, what is contained in that boast of rarely loving. And in this last item, especially, the secret of Nietzsche's nature is out. One guesses it many times, but perhaps nowhere in his works is it so strongly suggested, as in a certain beautiful chapter of "Zarathustra." He shows himself in it surrounded by all the beauty of life, all the tenderness of life, and by the majestic fact of life's eternal renovation; and he shows himself, at the same time, without the smallest thrill of emotional recognition, without the faintest sense of being a part of it, without the faintest longing to merge himself therein, to take it in, to give himself to it, without a trace of the universal instinct to assimilate, to be renovated, to add to it in one's turn. He shows himself separate, unmoved, impervious, unaltered, solitary, sterile. The reason why Nietzsche will always remain inferior to other thinkers, from Plato and Lucretius to Spinoza and Schopenhauer, is that, for all his talk of "loving the inevitable," the man has no experience of the fact of love. I do not speak of love of human beings. Not to know that is certainly a lack and limitation, but there are lacks and limitations far deeper and graver still than that: not to unite in thought and feeling with the thought and the feeling of which the world is full; not to appreciate, not to admire, not to reverence; not to unite in joy with what is lovely, in reverence with what, in this universe, is mysterious; nay, not to unite in the fruitful struggle of hatred with what is hateful.

But Nietzsche's Super-Man was to say "Yes" to the whole of life, to "love the inevitable"—that is to say, as he himself explained, that which most human beings could scarcely endure; he was to love rarely; or more correctly speaking—for those who have the power of loving must needs love whenever there is occasion, and the occasion is not rare, but common—he was not to love, in the word's real sense, at all.

Haunted, hag-ridden, by the sense of his own sore and strug-

gling ego, Nietzsche, true to the autobiographical instincts which he discovered in all philosophic systematizing, made life synonymous with that ego's realization and assertion. "Give," he wrote in one of his latest and finest works, "Give me, ye heavenly ones, give me madness! madness to make me believe at last in myself." But in this world of intuitive and imitative action, of reflex-like instincts implanted inextricably deep below consciousness, there is no need for special self-belief or self-assertion; or, rather, self-belief and self-assertion are bound to exist, to push, to act, to speak, everywhere and in everything, whether they be conscious or not. The realization of one's own ego is—even when it is not the fly's self-realization on the coach-wheel—the most unnecessary epi-phenomenon; nay, the least fruitful exercise of an idle dilettanteism. Believe in oneself! Why is it not enough that we believe in the objects of our love and our hate, in the aims of our impulses and actions? And does life depend upon the fiat of individual self-realization? What is this childish trifling about saying "'Yes' to life," about loving the inevitable? Man, the inevitable can do without your approval! And Life has you safe in its clutches, Life, Death—and the madness you invoked, also.

Why have we spent so much time—which would have sufficed to collect a volume of sane and useful sayings out of Nietzsche's work—upon the analysis of his unhappy, morbid and sterile personality? Partly because, in the universal and necessary reconsideration of all our previous habits of belief and standards of conduct, the imitation of Nietzsche's attitude constitutes a real, though a momentary, danger to some of us. But partly, also, because the attitude of Nietzsche suggests in its main characteristics, and helps us to construct even in some of its details, an attitude towards the universe of an exactly contrary nature. In analyzing the sham "Yes" which this passionate No-Sayer flung in the face of the life he had stripped of all living quality, we may have been led to conceive a more genuine "Yes" addressed to a more real life. And thus we may have come to reverse the prayer of Nietzsche, and to exclaim, in humility and confidence: "Give us, ye Heavenly Ones, Sanity; so that we may believe in all which is not merely our own self."

VERNON LEE.

THE PHILIPPINE PROBLEM FROM A FILIPINO STANDPOINT.

BY JUAN SUMULONG, MEMBER OF THE HONORARY BOARD OF FILIPINO COMMISSIONERS TO THE ST. LOUIS EXPOSITION, AND PROFESSOR IN THE MANILA LAW SCHOOL.

In treating of Philippine questions, it is of great importance to know at the outset whether the Filipinos are a political unit, capable of pursuing a common object and of attaining it; whether, in short, they constitute a true nationality, or whether, on the contrary, they are merely tribes, an accidental combination of elements, without mutual affinity and ready to damage or annihilate each other.

It is clear that, in speaking of the Filipino people, we refer especially to that predominant part which is composed of seven millions of Christian Filipinos, and make little account of the remaining six hundred thousand, whether they be Itas, Moros or Igorrotes, who belong to a separate category, and who, by reason of their insignificance in numbers, and their lack of European culture, bear a social and political relation to the Christian Filipinos similar to that which the North-American Indians bore to the people of the United States during the first fifty years of the history of that nation. These Christian Filipinos, that is to say, the Tagalogs, Visayans, Ilocanos, Bicols, Pangasinanos and Pampangos (to name only the principal groups), are from the same Malayan stock* that, in pre-Spanish times, came to populate the archipelago.

Although it may appear strange, the fact which has given the

* The word "Tagalog," by which is signified one of the most important nuclei of the Filipino population, is derived from "*taga-ilog*," the "dwellers upon the river," and this name was given to all of the early Malays that came to the islands, who before their immigration lived upon the banks of a Malayan river.

greatest strength to the claim that the Filipinos are composed of tribes is also, without doubt, that which furnishes the best evidence that they form a homogeneous whole. Because the Filipinos speak various dialects, some people believe they do not constitute a nation. But one who makes a slight study of these dialects promptly sees they are no more than variations of a single original language, which has become modified for reasons that only a prolonged study of pre-Spanish Philippine history can explain. The slight mutual intercourse among the early Filipinos, living in islands and regions isolated from each other, gave rise to the differentiations that produced the dialects. But the physical characteristics that mark the Tagalogs, Visayans, Ilocanos, Bicols, etc., show at a glance their close relationship.

An appeal to history makes the point still clearer. The unifying effect of Christian civilization, the acts in which the Filipino people united in order vigorously to oppose the all-embracing influence of the Friars under the Spanish régime, and, later, the very war that was waged by all Filipinos against Spain and the United States for the sake of independence, are practical demonstrations of a real and definite unity. Notwithstanding that the settled policy of the Spanish domination, represented by the Friar influence, was to divide the Filipinos, and so govern more conveniently, it may be safely said that it would be difficult to find, in the last fifty years, a single Filipino who has felt himself a stranger or indifferent to the common interests; while, in general, all Filipinos have shared in the joys and woes that events have brought to their country. With such facts in view, only those with a warped judgment can fail to recognize that in the Philippines there is being developed a people whose political individuality must soon or late be recognized. An American, or a European, can from his point of view have doubts whether the Filipinos could to-day establish and sustain an independent government. But, if he knows Filipino history, if he is capable of giving a just value to the progress achieved by the Filipinos under a system of government in which everything tended to prevent their improvement and their advance, he will recognize much that was heroic in their efforts, and he will be inclined rather to meditate on what they might have become under happier auspices than to judge of them by undertakings never brought to a successful issue.

At the present time, we find ourselves under the American sovereignty that has come to replace that of Spain. That American sovereignty has been accepted in the belief that it would give the Filipinos a chance to pursue their own development, to acquire experience for themselves, and to face the responsibilities that history rightfully places upon those peoples who hold their destinies in their own hands. The Filipinos wish to make a trial on their own account. They wish to learn the art of self-government by practising it, for that is the only way to know its secrets. Are there difficulties in the path, and even dangers? Then it is worthy of our effort to meet these difficulties and dangers—if they exist—and vanquish them. Until the country sees her own children as the predominating element in her government, the most important step under American sovereignty in the Philippines will not have been taken. We know, from what we hear and what we read, that not a few Americans insist that the control of the government and its administration shall remain in the hands of American functionaries; while others, not content with appropriating the lion's share, throw upon the whole Filipino race the shadow of distrust, and with injurious intent openly declare, or covertly insinuate, that it is incapable of understanding and organizing a republican system of government. When we learn of such things, we infer that there is in some Americans a prejudice that does not permit them to render full justice to other peoples.

With respect to those who desire the United States to have a hold practically absolute over the government of the islands, we have to say that they misconceive the Philippine question and do not correctly trace its lines. The Filipino people has received under Spain not an Oriental but a European education, which has brought into being a body of men capable of directing the government of the country. It has often been said that the great majority of the population lack not only political experience, but even the most elementary education. But this last is not a correct statement, for, apart from Spanish, the Filipinos who cannot at least read and write their own dialect* are few and rare indeed. As for political experience, it is

* A similar condition is to be noted in a great part of the Japanese nation. Yet, nevertheless, no one would have the right to say that the Japanese, who know only their own dialect, are wholly ignorant.

not strange that the people in large part should be without it, simply because they have always been without the opportunity of acquiring it. This, however, furnishes only one reason the more for not withholding for any further period the exercise of political rights from a people that has shed its blood to obtain them. When a people rises as one man and fights for a thing, it must be that the people not only knows what it is fighting for, but that it recognizes to the full the value of the prize.

Little need be said about the educational progress made by the Filipinos, or the advance they have made, under the existing government, in their participation in the work of the judiciary and other branches of administration; for it is presumed the American public is already informed of the interest that a Filipino family takes in sending its children to public schools, and of the efficiency, loyalty and devotion to duty with which Filipino officials have performed that part of the general task which fell to them. Let us, therefore, consider the question dispassionately, on the supposition that the object of the presence of the United States in the Philippines is to aid the Filipinos to establish a free government of their own. Now, it is evident that it is not a question of forming a nation *de novo,* but rather of carrying through a work complementary to that which has been already done, and this does not necessitate on the part of the United States a retention of supreme control over the islands. All Filipinos, it would appear, wish, so far as suitable and practicable, to adopt in the Philippines the excellent system of government that has been found to work so well in the United States. But the very labor of selection and adaptation can better be done by Filipinos, who can be supposed to see more clearly what is suitable to the conditions of the country, and therefore what is desirable, and can be trusted to work more conscientiously. It is true that the Filipinos, in beginning this difficult work, will need the aid of the Americans, because in such cases the counsels of experience have a priceless value. It is true, also, that the Filipinos, following the example of Japan, wish to extend widely in their country the knowledge of the English tongue, although not for the sake of becoming more civilized, but rather because English is the indispensable vehicle of communication with the most advanced portion of the human race. But, granting that everything goes to show that the help of the Americans

in the government and in educational work would be useful, almost, indeed, indispensable for a certain period, it is wholly unnecessary to conclude for that reason that the Filipinos must be deprived of the responsibility of their own government.

It is neither impatience, nor yet the ambition to become the chief figures in the government, that impels the Filipinos to call urgently for the establishment of self-government. It is only the desire to simplify difficulties, which are each day becoming greater and more to be feared. The unsettled political condition of the islands encourages many wholly unscrupulous American residents of the Philippines constantly to urge that the United States should treat the Filipinos as Great Britain treats her Crown Colonies. Such an attitude naturally serves to inspire distrust in the breast of the Filipino. Would it not be salutary, therefore, and would it not have a good effect on this class of Americans, a most numerous body, if the tangible evidence of *deeds* should be afforded that the final object of the American occupation is to give to the Filipinos a government *by Filipinos?* Although the conduct of many American officials gives an exalted idea of their mission in the Philippines, unfortunately the same cannot be said of them all. Thus these circumstances unite to show why the American Government receives no great support among the masses, for they retain a lively recollection of the shifty ways of the Spanish régime.

Often it is asked why the Filipinos do not insist upon their personal rights, as guaranteed them by the organic law of the Philippines, and why they allow abuses to flourish, or a punishable offence to go unpunished. Some have attributed this phenomenon to a lack of acquaintance with the rights conferred upon them by that act. Now, it is not possible that a person who is the object of an injury should be ignorant that he has a legal remedy. The real trouble in the Philippines is that, justly or unjustly, there is a lack of faith in the possibility of obtaining it. Other phenomena of the same description might be cited. Only when in the government of the islands the native element shall have its proper representation will confidence be restored, and the working of such a government will be more efficient and will better subserve the good of the country. Not only, then, do considerations of justice, but also considerations of political expediency, counsel the establishment of a truly representative gov-

ernment, as the sole means of bringing about a normal situation in the public affairs of the Philippines.

In intimate connection with the modification of the provisional government of the Philippines should be the definition of the future relations between the islands and the United States; that is to say, whether there shall be annexation, a protectorate or absolute independence. It is not the purpose of these lines to resolve these questions by considering the movements of American purposes and opinions. To discuss *a posteriori* whether the United States acquired their sovereignty over the Philippines legitimately, or illegitimately, would be no less indiscreet. The Filipinos are more anxious in regard to the present and future conduct of the United States in the Philippines, and, if that is good and beneficial to the country, the question of the past should be a secondary consideration.

But what is the attitude of the Filipino people, or at least of a majority of the Filipino people, upon the question of its own future? It would require a careful investigation to discover the true opinion of the country. With the exception of the Federal Party, there exists to-day no organized political groups with their ideas concretely expressed in their platforms, and thus the difficulty of investigation is greatly augmented.

Even the Federal Party is to-day in a period of critical evolution—perhaps of radical and important transformation.*

At the beginning, the Federal Party was partly composed of those who had taken part in the revolution, but who were then sincerely in favor of peace, of the adoption of a government upon the American plan, and of a process of evolution in order to bring this all happily about. Others came into the party when they became convinced of the intention of the United States to retain the islands, and they cherished for a time the hope of forming a part of the American Union, believing in good faith that, having lost the hope of independence, the best opportunity for the Filipinos was to enjoy the same rights as are enjoyed by the citizens of the Republic that had come to assume sovereignty over the country. Many others, and these formed the majority, when they saw that the war was both use-

* At the present time, the Federal Party is in process of reorganization upon a new declaration of principles and a new platform, and it can be asserted with confidence that, whatever other results are reached, the idea of annexation or federation will not be countenanced.

less and prejudicial, and that to compel the United States to grant independence was not feasible, proposed to themselves first of all to work with the Federal Party for the pacification of the country, but without abandoning the idea of attaining independence later on, by peaceable means and by appealing to the sense of justice of the American people.

Thus, as is seen, in treating of the only organized political party in the Philippines, it is easy to fall into error, unless the necessary knowledge is had of the men fighting in its ranks and of the events that led to its formation. As for the rest of the people that do not belong to the Federal Party, they are frankly in favor of independence in short order, and do not care for the process of evolution that is the characteristic idea of the misnamed Federalists. Nevertheless, it would be a great mistake to believe that the Nationalists cling to-day, with the same rigidity as during the war and the years immediately following it, to the doctrine of independence immediate, complete and absolute. The growing rivalries between the conquering Powers resulting in an aggressive policy in the Far East, the experience that Korea is actually undergoing, finding herself, against her will, enveloped in a bloody war, have opened the eyes of the irreconcilable Filipinos and have brought them to the belief that of equal importance with the obtaining independence itself is the securing of a guarantee that that independence shall not be a thing precarious, at the mercy of the ambitions of the strong.

There are still two other political groups in the Philippines, namely, the Liberals and the Democrats. But it can be affirmed that the reason for their existence is not very clear, for the Liberals have aims similar to those of the Federal Evolutionists, and the Democrats are almost as pronounced advocates of nationalism as the Nationalists themselves. The so-called Labor Party forms a group apart, and, although its organization is not active in general politics, it sympathizes with the Nationalists and Radicals.

It results, then, that in reality there exist only two great parties in the Philippines; on the one hand are the Federalists, who should be called the Evolutionists; and, on the other, are those of every political complexion who favor speedy independence. Taking, then, into consideration only those points in which both sides agree, the following can be accepted as representing the aspirations of a great majority of the people:

1. The immediate establishment of a government for Filipinos by Filipinos, with the aid of the Americans;*

2. The future independence of the country—as soon as practicable, according to the idea of the Nationalists; after a period of evolution, according to the Evolutionists;

3. A Protectorate by the United States over the Philippine Republic, or, if that is not realizable, an international guarantee, obtained with the aid and influence of the Government of the United States, securing the inviolability of Philippine independence.

The perspicacity of that noted American statesman, Mr. Root, ex-Secretary of War, as well as the profound knowledge of the aspirations of the Filipinos that he acquired during the time when he was ably filling his elevated position, enabled him, in his address before the Republican Convention in Chicago, to trace in broad lines the policy that appears at once to be the most satisfactory to the Filipinos and, at the same time, the most just, and hence the most worthy of the great American people. The eloquent words in which Mr. Root substantially echoes the true aspirations of the Philippine people will have a most beneficial effect on public tranquillity in the Philippines, and will powerfully aid in promoting a good understanding between Americans and Filipinos. I desire to conclude by reproducing the wise recommendations of Mr. Root in respect to American policy in the Philippines:

"None can foretell the future; but there seems no reasonable cause to doubt that, under the policy already effectively inaugurated, the institutions already implanted, and the processes already begun, in the Philippine Islands, if these be not repressed and interrupted, the Philippine people will follow in the footsteps of the people of Cuba; that more slowly, indeed, because they are not as advanced, yet as surely, they will grow in capacity for self-government, and, receiving power as they grow in capacity, will come to bear substantially such relations to the people of the United States as do now the people of Cuba, differing in details as conditions and needs differ, but the same in principle and the same in beneficial results."

JUAN SUMULONG.

* See the speech of acceptance by President Roosevelt, July 27th, 1904.

THE NEW AMERICAN MUSIC.

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN.

THE young American composer of unrecognized ability occupies a position as discouraging as it is anomalous. Whereas the young painter of marked talent, the young writer of parts, the gifted young sculptor, find a constant invitation to prove their capacities, the composer of serious and admirable purpose encounters, on the contrary, a curiously persistent discouragement. If he writes for orchestra, where, among our foreign-born conductors, will he find one who is disposed to examine his tone-poem or his symphony with a view to discovering and exhibiting a new talent in contemporary music? What publisher will give a moment's consideration to his songs or piano works, if they are not cut after the most definitely appealing patterns? And we all know what prospect of consideration or production there is for an American opera under present conditions. One has only to state these facts, in the barest possible terms, to compel a recognition of them from any one familiar with the conditions of musical art in America. Not to put too fine a point upon it, the American composer of serious artistic purpose who has not already, or by extraneous means, acquired reputation of a commanding sort, has little or no opportunity of gaining a hearing for his work, or any recognition of its possible availability, through what one may call the recognized channels of musical publicity.

If this is true of the young composer whose ideals, although admirable, offer no impediment to their general acceptance by musicians and music-lovers of the better class, it will easily be seen how hopeless has been the case of the composer who does not choose to be bound by traditional formulas, but who prefers, like De Musset, to "drink out of his own glass."

I have used the past tense in speaking of the hopelessness of

such a case; for, in spite of the blighting indifference of which the conditions I have denoted are significant, it has very recently been made evident that those progressive and independent spirits who choose to declare in music the issue of an individual vision and inspiration are becoming an artistic force of irresistible potency; and for those of us who would modify a certain remarkable prophecy of Mr. George Meredith's so that it should accord with a conviction that the American genius will find its most influential expression in music, rather than in that art of which Mr. Meredith himself is so consummate a master, the immediate past has yielded a very definite surety and confirmation.

One of the younger group of contemporary American composers, Mr. Arthur Farwell,—a pupil of Humperdinck and a writer of expansive and poetic imagination,—realizing the authentic beauty and importance of the music which some of our less eminent native writers are producing, recently established at Newton Center, Massachusetts, a press which is devoted wholly to the publication of the best of this new music that he can procure,—considering it solely upon its artistic merits, and entirely aside from the question of a profitable popularity. It is an admirable enterprise—beyond question, as has elsewhere been said, the most determined, enlightened and altruistic endeavor to advance the highest interests of American music that has yet been made.

And how, one may reasonably ask, is the enterprise justifying itself? The answer is to be found in the best of the music which has so far been issued—music so untrammelled in its inspiration, so heedful and competent in its artistry, and of so challenging an independence in its construction and intent, that one would be venturesome who should assume to set bounds upon the possibilities of the creative power which, in the aggregate, achieved it.

Let any one who doubts the presence of an original and vital impulse in our native music consider some of Mr. Farwell's most significant publications. Turn, for example, to Mr. Henry F. Gilbert's "Two Verlaine Moods," a brace of poetic paraphrases for piano. Mr. Gilbert is, like his fellow musician, a resolute independent in his ideas and practices. His imagination is most readily kindled by the modern or the esoteric in poetry and thought; so that one finds him resorting continually, for subject-matter and inspiration, to such masters of the present as Maeterlinck, Flaubert, Verlaine. In the "Two Verlaine Moods," one

notes immediately the authentic quality and color of the French lyrist; but here, too, is a dexterous and fluent art, an art distinguished and vivid, forceful and subtly articulated. A more recent work of Mr. Gilbert's is his paraphrase, for piano, of Poe's fantasy in prose, "The Island of the Fay." Mr. Gilbert has found a congenial and grateful theme for musical exposition in the poet's conception of a magical episode of haunted forest depths and mysterious faery presences. He has reflected precisely the mood of dream and remote enchantment conveyed by the words, and has composed a tone-paraphrase of memorable beauty and vividness. There are many passages of rare imaginative force, and the writing has an evident distinction.

Mr. Farwell's "Domain of Hurakan," a study in elemental symbolism, is an equally remarkable piece of writing in a wholly different kind. It is a fantasy conceived in the spirit of the Indian creation-myths, a finely vigorous and notable achievement. There are few more masterly passages in any music of American composition than the superb climax with which the work ends, and the insinuatingly lovely episode in B-major, with its eloquent intimation of nocturnal moods. A setting of a poem by William Blake also lingers in the memory (although here, for a moment, one is reminded that Wagner lived and wrote), together with a hauntingly poetic impression, for oboe and piano, inspired by Mr. Arthur Davies's painting, "Morfydd": a girl seated upon a bank of moss in a deep wood, dreamily plaiting her hair, while a youth beside her plays upon a harp. Then there is Mr. Farwell's piano piece, "Toward the Dream," an expression in free and ample form of the idea of aspiration and noble striving. In its poetic substance the music recalls Schumann's "*Aufschwung*," though Mr. Farwell has things of quite a different kind to say. A piano piece by Mr. Edward Burlingame Hill, "At the Grave of a Hero," is profound and true in feeling and impressive in utterance. And one must recall with a very keen pleasure Mr. Harvey Worthington Loomis's felicitous arrangement of two Verlaine poems, "On the Terrace" and "In the Moon Shower,"—the last contrived, curiously but with exquisite effect, as a spoken recitation, with obligato of piano, violin and voice; a movement from a piano sonata by Mr. Farwell; Mr. Gilbert's ardent and colorful scene for dramatic soprano, "Salammbô's Invocation to Tänith" (the text from the novel of Flaubert); and his poignant setting of

the Lament of Deirdré from Ferguson's "The Death of the Children of Usnach": music saturated with the sense of that "heart-break over fallen things," that wildness of passionate revolt, that tragic and piercing melancholy, which are Celtic—and overwhelming.

What, it may be asked, is the essential nature, the purport, of this vivid new impulse in our native musical art? One would not be too impetuous in definition who should assert that it is, in essence, a force making most directly for *liberation:* for a broader range of content and an expansion of the expressional vehicle. That, beyond doubt, is its unique and most admirable characteristic. We are to learn that the whole of life and experience, in their emotional substance, is to be regarded as fit subject-matter for the musical artist who shall bring to them the requisite power of clairvoyant intuition and selective intelligence. These ardent young innovators have definitely pointed the way; they have laid under contribution a territory as illimitable as it is rewarding. Human experience, distilled in the substance of poetry, of drama, of painting; the manifold aspects and contours of the natural world, even the subtler intimations of spiritual consciousness, are, they teach us, susceptible of the most luminous musical manifestation. They have found their inspiration in regions widely various and apart, yet all of valid import and significance.

This of the content and substance of their work; of the form in which they have cast it, of the expressional means they have chosen to employ, one may say that it, also, is the signal of a new and vivifying principle. Here, too, the movement is clearly in the way of liberation, of an extension and enlargement of the expressional medium—these, as Fiona Macleod has but lately written of certain of the modern Celtic poets, are "artists curiously persuading art." The utmost freedom is exercised in the conception, articulation and embodiment of the musical idea. The traditional restrictions in the matter of key-relationships, harmonic consistency and melodic structure, of which music has been growing more and more intolerant since Wagner pointed the way to complete emancipation, are here unhesitatingly cast aside,—with, in some instances, an even more persistently adventurous spirit than is exemplified in the brilliant audacities of Richard Strauss. The governing aim is to achieve the quintessence of expressional

power, the precise embodiment and equivalent, at every point, of the particular thought and emotional intention of the subject which has been chosen for representation.

The quality of the musical style which is, in varying manner, the product of this principle of uncompromising flexibility does not by any means, as yet, signify the existence of a distinctive "American" school. Nor is it desirable that it should. We hear much talk of the need of such a national school, whereby we may offset an assumed "German," or "French," or "Russian" school. But when will it be recognized that there are no such schools, in any important sense of the term? There is the art of Richard Strauss and the art of Mahler, or Weingartner, or Humperdinck—all Germans, yet separate and individual in the artistic implications of their several styles; and in France there is the art of Claude Debussy, which is quite irreconcilable with the art of Vincent d'Indy; and, looking to Russia, is one to find a common artistic denominator for the Rimsky-Korsakoff of "Mlada" and the Rachmaninoff of "The Cliff"? So, among this group of young American music-makers, there are separate and resolute individualities, associated though they may be, and characterized by an allegiance to certain informing tenets and convictions.

Let there be no misconception in the matter: this music professes, through its appreciators, no virtue merely for being of American origin: they are not of those who, in the caustic phrase of Mr. Philip Hale, would "cover mediocrity with a cloak of patriotism." The music which Mr. Farwell presents to our attention is, as it happens, American, and it is abundantly characteristic; but, first and above all, it is excellent and moving art.

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRESENT STATUS OF REPUDIATED STATE BONDS.

BY MARK SULLIVAN.

At the present moment there is pending in the United States Supreme Court at Washington a judgment in a suit so interesting in itself, so picturesque in its historic background, so vital in its bearing upon some hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of State bonds now regarded as practically worthless, that it merits careful examination. The judgment is for $27,400; it is in favor of the State of South Dakota and against the State of North Carolina. The decree is that North Carolina must pay this amount, together with costs of suit, "on or before the first Monday of January, 1905"; and it is provided that, if North Carolina does not pay, certain property belonging to that State shall be seized, advertised and sold at public auction, "such sale to be made at the east front door of the Capitol-building in Washington."

The history of this remarkable case can best be followed, and the *pros* and *cons* which caused the Supreme Court to split into sides of four and five in handing down their decision can best be understood, through a chronological statement of the incidents which led up to the suit. The first step consisted in the sending of the following letter, on September 10th, 1901, from a broker in New York to the Honorable Charles Burke, a Member of Congress from the State of South Dakota:

"The undersigned, one of the members of the firm of ———, has decided, after consultation with the other holders of the second-mortgage bonds issued by the State of North Carolina, to donate ten of these bonds to the State of South Dakota.

"The holders of these bonds have waited for some thirty years in the

hope that the State of North Carolina would realize the justice of their claims for the payment of these bonds.

"The bonds are all now about due, besides, of course, the coupons, which amount to some 170 per cent. of the face of the bond.

"The holders of these bonds have been advised that they cannot maintain a suit against the State of North Carolina on these bonds, but that such a suit can be maintained by a foreign state or by one of the United States.

"The owners of these bonds are mostly, if not entirely, persons who liberally give charity to the needy, the deserving, and the unfortunate.

"These bonds can be used to great advantage by States or foreign governments, and the majority owners would prefer to use them in this way rather than take the trifle which is offered by the debtor.

"If your State should succeed in collecting these bonds, it would be the inclination of the owners of a majority of the total issue now outstanding to make additional donations to such governments as may be able to collect from the repudiating State, rather than accept the small pittance offered in settlement.

"The donors of these ten bonds would be pleased if the Legislature of South Dakota should apply the proceeds of these bonds to the State University or to some of its asylums or other charities."

Lawyers, and persons familiar with the story of that curious and widely discussed incident of American history known as "Repudiation," may understand this letter fully. For others, some explanation is necessary.

To make this explanation clear the most important fact is this: A State Government cannot be sued by an individual. When this broker says in his letter that "the holders of these bonds have been advised that they cannot maintain suit against the State of North Carolina on these bonds, but that such a suit can be maintained by . . . one of the United States," he has reference to two provisions in the United States Constitution. If an individual has a claim against a State, he is utterly without redress so far as the Court is concerned; but, if one State has a claim against another State, it can bring suit in the United States Court. This state of the law makes it possible for any commonwealth to evade its debts whenever it is so minded, leaving the creditor without redress. At various times, eleven of the Southern States, North Carolina among the number, have taken advantage of this situation to repudiate their bonded debts to the extent of some hundreds of millions of dollars. The generous donor who signed the letter quoted above found himself in possession of a large number of bonds of the State of North Caro-

lina which that State refused to pay, and which he had no way of compelling the State to pay, and which were practically valueless. But it occurred to this broker, or it occurred to his lawyer, that if some State Government owned these bonds they could be collected; hence the gift. To the broker, the bonds were worth nothing; to South Dakota, they would be worth their full face value.

It may readily be imagined that South Dakota received this gift with some surprise; but the State Legislature passed an act entitled, "An Act to Require the Acceptance and Collection of Grants, Devises, Bequests, Donations, and Assignments to the State of South Dakota." Inasmuch as this act will be examined with some scrutiny later on, it is here quoted in full:

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of South Dakota:

"Section 1. That whenever any grant, devise, bequest, donation, or gift or assignment of money, bonds, or choses in action, or of any property, real or personal, shall be made to this State, the Governor is hereby directed to receive and accept the same, so that the right and title to the same shall pass to this State; and all such bonds, notes, or choses in action, or the proceeds thereof when collected, and all other property or thing of value, so received by the State as aforesaid, shall be reported by the Governor to the Legislature, to the end that the same may be covered into the public treasury or appropriated to the State University or to the public schools, or to State charities, as may hereafter be directed by law.

"Section 2. Whenever it shall be necessary to protect or assert the right or title of the State to any property so received or derived as aforesaid, or to collect or to reduce into possession any bond, note, bill, or chose in action, the Attorney-General is directed to take the necessary and proper proceedings, and to bring suit in the name of the State in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal, and to prosecute all such suits, and is authorized to employ counsel to be associated with him in such suits or actions, who, with him, shall fully represent the State, and shall be entitled to reasonable compensation out of the recoveries and collections in such suits and actions."

Armed with this statute, South Dakota accepted the bonds, and the Attorney-General of the State, after engaging the assistance of eminent counsel, prepared for suit. North Carolina defended, and argument was heard before the full bench of the Supreme Court at Washington for three days during April, 1903. Further argument was heard in November, 1903; and again, in January of the present year, the Supreme Court gave three

more days to the hearing of still further argument on the involved points of the case. Thereafter, the Court kept the case under advisement for several weeks; and, finally, some months ago, the decision quoted above, in favor of South Dakota, was handed down by Mr. Justice Brewer, with whom four of his fellow Justices agreed. The remaining four Justices handed down an unusually complete and forcible opinion of dissent. Decidedly, there are two sides to this case.

Before considering, in detail, the reasons for the opinion, and the reasons for the dissent, and before considering in which direction the best public policy points, it will be well briefly to review the history of repudiation.

During the early forties, one of the Southern States, filled with the railroad-building fever which then prevailed, applied to Baring Brothers, of London, for a loan. That firm, in considering the matter, discovered the provision of the United States Constitution which has been pointed out, and which would put them entirely at the mercy of the State's sense of moral obligation. To get further advice in the matter, they consulted Daniel Webster, then in the prime of his fame as a constitutional lawyer, and the most eminent American statesman of the day. Webster acknowledged that Baring Brothers' inference as to the law in the case was correct, but he went on to say that the loan was, nevertheless, a perfectly safe one. He wrote:

"The States cannot rid themselves of their obligations otherwise than by the payment of their debts. . . . They cannot get round the duty nor evade its source. Any failure to fulfil its obligations would be an open violation of public faith, to be followed by the penalty of dishonor and disgrace; a penalty, it may be presumed, which no State of the American Union would be likely to incur. . . . I believe that the citizens of the United States, like all honest men, regard debts, whether public or private, and whether existing at home or abroad, to be of moral as well as of legal obligation. If it were possible that any one of the States should, at any time, so entirely lose its self-respect and forget its duty as to violate the faith solemnly pledged for its pecuniary engagements, I believe there is no country upon earth—not even that of the injured creditor—in which such a proceeding would meet with less countenance or indulgence than it would receive from the great mass of the American people."

Whether Baring Brothers made the requested loan, and whether this particular State ever paid it back, I do not know; but it is a matter of history that, within ten years after Webster's elo-

quent assurance of the moral grandeur of the American States, the State of Mississippi borrowed, by the issue of bonds, seven million dollars from a European firm of bankers, who were then, as now, the most conspicuous family engaged in the business of loaning money to nations; and of this seven million dollars not one cent was paid back, either in principal or in interest. The Governor of the State declared, with the high-pitched fervor of virtuous indignation, that the banker had "in his veins the blood of Judas and of Shylock, and unites the qualities of both his countrymen. He has mortgages upon the silver-mines of Mexico and on the quicksilver-mines of Spain. He has advanced money to the Sublime Porte, and taken as security a mortgage upon the Holy City of Jerusalem and the sepulchre of our Saviour. It is for our people to say whether he shall have a mortgage upon our cotton-fields and make serfs of our children." And the State of Mississippi rose up in its mighty sovereignty and declared that it would never pay an honest debt to one so shameless.

Within thirty years, ten other Southern States followed Mississippi's example; borrowed some scores of millions of dollars; spent the money in public improvements—and then wiped the debt off their books by the simple expedient of refusing to pay.

It is not possible to state accurately just how many millions there are of these unpaid bonds outstanding. When the States repudiated them, they ceased to carry them on their books. Twenty years ago, the amount charged against each State was estimated as follows:

Alabama	$38,812,000
Arkansas	20,807,000
Florida	5,280,000
Georgia	13,580,000
Louisiana	32,115,000
Mississippi	22,600,000
North Carolina	48,350,000
South Carolina	19,500,000
Tennessee	29,850,000
Total	$230,894,000

Since then, the twenty years' accumulation of interest would have doubled the sum total.

These repudiated bonds were held, and are still held, by scores of small investors throughout the Northern States and in Eng-

land. They lie, with their big sheets of uncut coupons, in the dusty pigeonholes of desks. Occasionally, in settling up an estate, they come to light and are put upon the market. They command just about such a price as they are worth as historical curiosities. You can buy a gorgeously engraved and highly colored bond of the State of Louisiana, stamped with the State's seal and signed by the State officials, bearing the State's formal promise to pay $1,000, and interest which would now amount to over a thousand dollars more—you can buy this, or the bond of any of these repudiating States, for from five to fifteen dollars. It is ten of such bonds that figure in the present suit between South Dakota and North Carolina.

It is not to be supposed that the holders of these bonds viewed the arbitrary defiance of their legal rights with indifference. Some of the most scintillating gems in the whole literature of invective are to be found in the flood of angry protest and tart retort which passed between Northern investors and Southern repudiators. "Repudiation" was a term as familiar in the public prints of thirty years ago as "trusts" and "labor-unions" to-day. It was for the enrichment of literature that Sydney Smith, the noted English master of irony, had invested some of his savings in repudiated bonds and was, by his loss, stimulated to a strength and brilliancy of invective such as mere genius would never have inspired. He inveighed against "that total want of shame with which these things have been done; the callous immorality and deafness of the moral sense with which Europe has been plundered." He said:

"If I were an American of any of the honest States, I would never rest till I had compelled the dishonest States to be as honest as myself. The bad faith of one State brings disgrace on all, just as the common snakes are killed because vipers are injurious. I have a feeling that by that breed of men I have been robbed and ruined, and I shudder and keep aloof. I am astonished that the honest States of America do not draw a *cordon sanitaire* around their unpaying brethren—that the truly mercantile New-Yorkers and the thoroughly honest people of Massachusetts do not, in their European visits, wear uniforms with 'S. S.' or 'Solvent States' worked in gold letters upon the coat."

It is worth noting that the State which had issued Mr. Smith's bonds, whether in response to the sting of his satire or not, afterward paid in full with interest.

The defrauded investors did not stop with mere words; they

used every means which the richness of the stake caused ingenuity to suggest for persuading, bullying or coercing the Southern States into payment. But the repudiators were deaf to persuasion; and, when the force of the law was attempted, they smiled complacently behind their constitutional security.

Naturally, in the search for a remedy, the fact which has just been used in South Dakota's suit against North Carolina, the fact that, while an individual cannot sue, another State can sue, was soon noticed and dwelt upon. Ingenious lawyers sought for some means to take advantage of it. Finally, they hit upon a plan which offered some hope of success—a scheme which deserves a high place among the devious subterfuges of the law. The first step in it was to find a State willing to lend itself to the purposes of the bondholders. New Hampshire proved pliant; and the Legislature of that State passed a statute admirably adapted to serve the ends of those who wished to use the constitutional privileges of the commonwealth for their private ends. The statute, abbreviated and amended to show merely its general purport, read as follows:

"Whenever any citizen of this State shall be the owner of any claim against any of the other States . . . such citizen holding such claim may assign the same to the State of New Hampshire, and deposit the assignment thereof, . . . together with all the evidence necessary to substantiate such claim, with the Attorney-General of the State. Upon such deposit being made, it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General to examine such claim and the evidence thereof; and if, in his opinion, there is a valid claim which shall be just and equitable to enforce, . . . he, the Attorney-General, shall, upon the assignor of such claim depositing with him such sum as he, the said Attorney-General, shall deem necessary to cover the expenses and disbursements incident to, or which may become incident to, the collection of said claim, bring such . . . proceedings in the name of the State of New Hampshire, in the Supreme Court of the United States, as he, the said Attorney-General, shall deem necessary for the recovery of the money due upon such claim; and it shall be the duty of the said Attorney-General to prosecute such action or actions to final judgment for the collection of said claim, and to carry such judgment into effect, or, with the consent of the assignor, to compromise, adjust and settle such claim before or after judgment. Nothing in this act shall authorize the expenditure of any money belonging to this State, but the expenses of said proceedings shall be paid by the assignor of such claim; and the assignor of such claim may associate with the Attorney-General in the prosecution thereof, in the name of the State of New Hampshire, such other counsel as the

assignor may deem necessary, but the State shall not be liable for the fees of such counsel, or any part thereof. The Attorney-General shall keep all moneys collected upon such claim, or by reason of any compromise of any such claim, separate and apart from any other moneys of this State which may be in his hands, and shall deposit the same to his own credit, as special trustee under this act, in such bank or banks as he shall select; and the said Attorney-General shall pay to the assignor of such claims all such sums of money as may be recovered by him in compromise or settlement of such claims, deducting therefrom all expenses incurred by said Attorney-General."

It will be observed that the effect of this statute was to make the State a collecting-agent, to perform for certain individuals the work of collecting their overdue claims. As soon as this law was passed, some repudiated bonds were deposited, in the manner provided by the statute, with the Attorney-General of New Hampshire, and a test case was made up. Further evidence of the nature of the relation between New Hampshire and the individuals whose bonds the State was trying to collect is to be found in the following sentence from the agreement signed by the individuals, when, in accordance with the statute, they filed their bonds with the Attorney-General:

"And we do hereby covenant with the said State that, if an attempt is made by it to collect the said claim from the State of Louisiana, we will pay all the expenses of the collection of the same."

In due time, the case was heard before the Supreme Court. The decision was handed down by Chief-Justice Waite, and three brief sentences from his opinion will show what he thought of the elaborate subterfuge:

"The real question, therefore, is whether these holders of repudiated bonds can sue in the name of their respective States, after getting the consent of the State, or, to put it another way, whether a State can allow the use of its name in such a suit for the benefit of one of its citizens. . . . This State is nothing more nor less than a mere collecting agent of the owners of the bonds and coupons; and, while the suits are in the names of the States, they are under the actual control of individual citizens, and are prosecuted and carried on altogether by and for them. . . . Such being the case, we are satisfied that we are prohibited, both by the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, from entertaining these suits."

This happened just twenty years ago. With the collapse of this attempt, all effort to collect the repudiated bonds ceased,

until the commencement of the present suit of South Dakota against North Carolina. In the light of this historical perspective, an examination of the merits of this present suit may show what decision on it would further the best public policy.

It is clear that this present suit was conceived in the same spirit as the one that failed in 1884. Chief-Justice Waite threw New Hampshire's case out of Court because the bonds were not the *bona fide* property of the State—New Hampshire was merely a trustee or agent. Obviously, the next step in this series of legal experiments upon the Supreme Court was to make some State a *bona fide* owner of the bonds. South Dakota was willing to step into New Hampshire's shoes, and the bonds were turned over to that commonwealth, with a letter which was made carefully explicit as to the completeness of the transfer.

This apparent completeness of the transfer is what caused Justice Brewer to give his decision in favor of South Dakota. On the face of it, the transfer was without reservation, and he declined to go behind the record to seek reasons which might have caused him to decide otherwise than as he did. He said:

> "It is true that the gift may be considered a rare and unexpected one. Apparently, the statute of South Dakota was passed in view of the expected gift, and probably the donor made the gift under a not unreasonable expectation that South Dakota would bring action against North Carolina to enforce these bonds, and that such action might inure to his benefit as the owner of other like bonds. But the motive with which a gift is made, whether good or bad, does not affect its validity or the question of jurisdiction."

Apparently, the Justice was strongly impressed by the necessity of explaining that he could not go behind the plain fact appearing upon the records, that South Dakota was the *bona fide* owner of the bonds. He quoted from another Justice of the Supreme Court this sentence: "If the law concerned itself with the motives of parties, new complications would be introduced into statutes which might seriously obscure their real merits." And, having conceded that South Dakota was the *bona fide* owner of the bonds, he felt compelled to give judgment in her favor.

The plain effect of that judgment, the law relating to repudiated bonds as it stands to-day, is this: Whenever by any sort of transfer which, so far as the records show, is *bona fide,* any State finds itself the owner of repudiated bonds whose conditions

are sufficiently analogous, in a legal sense, to the bonds in the present suit, that State can sue the repudiating State in the Supreme Court, and recover judgment. The perversion of public policy, the gross abuses, which may readily arise from this state of the law, can best be understood by a close examination of the statute by which South Dakota acquired the bonds in the present suit. For this purpose, it will be sufficient to quote five lines of the statute to which Mr. Justice White called emphatic attention in his strong dissenting opinion, in which he opposed permitting South Dakota to recover, italicizing the words which he italicized:

"The Attorney-General is authorized to employ counsel to be associated with him, in such suits or actions, who, with him, shall fully represent the State, and shall be entitled to reasonable compensation *out of the recoveries and collections in such suits and actions.*"

Now, what is the magic of these italicized words, which, alone, Justice White declares, make the suit one which the Court ought to refuse to lend its aid to. Their significance can best be illustrated by a supposititious case.

Suppose I buy ten thousand, or a hundred thousand, dollars of these bonds—as I may well be able to do, unless this present decision has raised their price—for one per cent. of their face value. Suppose I go to the proper official of South Dakota and say: "I am going to give you these bonds. I see by your statute that you are authorized to employ a lawyer to collect them. Now, I know a lawyer, A. He is my personal counsel. He is perfectly familiar with all the legal conditions of these bonds and is altogether the best man you can employ to collect them." It is only reasonable to suppose that the recipient of so bounteous a gift would be amiable enough to employ my friend A. And, without a doubt, as fees for lawyers go in the world of high finance, what the statute calls "a reasonable compensation" for the services of my friend, A., would be at least thirty per cent. of the face value of the bonds. And when A. has got his handsome fee, might not some generous impulse actuate him to come to me and thank me for having put him in the way of picking so rich a plum? Might he not even give me half the fee he got? The net result would then be this: I should have paid one per cent. for the bonds, and received fifteen per cent.; my friend A. would have fifteen per cent., and South Dakota would have

seventy per cent. Decidedly, there would be a general sense of peace and satisfaction in every quarter, except North Carolina.

Now, under the plain wording of this statute, and under the decision in the present case, every one of these things could happen to-morrow. The feeblest imagination can picture the avenues of financial and political corruption which this opens up.

Still another possibility follows this decision. Suppose that South Dakota had *bought* these bonds, instead of receiving them as a gift. The decision hangs entirely on the fact that South Dakota was the *bona fide* owner of the bonds. There is no magic in the fact that she got them as a gift; she would be equally the *bona fide* owner if she had bought them. This decision opens up endless opportunities for speculatively minded States to trade in the obligations of sister States. Can any imagination exaggerate the scandals, the corruption of Legislatures and State officials, the limitless possibilities of graft which would follow, if States should start to trade on the power which this decision gives them? Suppose some pocket-borough Legislature, completely dominated by one man whose personal say-so would secure the passage of any act—there have been such Legislatures in the largest and oldest States. Suppose this man should buy up these repudiated bonds at a cent or two on the dollar, then order his Legislature to buy them from him at fifteen, or twenty, or fifty cents on the dollar, and sue the repudiating States. This, too, is a possibility under the present decision. And there are other reasons of public policy why this precedent is unfortunate. They are too lengthy and too involved in legal technicality to be explained here; but the interested reader will find them set forth with strength and cogency in the dissenting opinion of Justices White, Fuller, McKenna and Day, which protests vigorously against—to use the language of Mr. Justice White—"endowing every State with the power of speculating upon stale and unenforceable claims of individuals against other States, thus not only doing injustice, but also overthrowing the fiscal independence of every State, and destroying that harmony between them which it was the avowed purpose of the Constitution to establish and cement."

Just here it should be explained, lest laymen misinterpret the scope of the present decision, that these repudiated bonds of the various States were issued for different purposes, with different

conditions which affect, to a greater or less degree, their legal standing. The bonds sued on in the present case were each secured by a specific mortgage on certain stock of the railroad for the building of which they were issued. Speaking technically and legally, this decision is a binding precedent only for this particular issue of bonds and for such of the other bonds as have identical conditions. Bonds which vary will have to stand or fall in future suits according as they are more or less analogous to these bonds.

It may be inferred from what has been said that I do not think these bonds ought to be collected at all. This is far from the truth. What is to be protested against, and what the dissenting Justices disapprove, is this beating the Constitution about the stump, and sacrificing the dignity of sovereign States, to serve sordid ends. The Southern States ought to pay every cent of these repudiated bonds. It is possible that in due time these States will see this matter in the same light. But the day when they shall see it, and pay their repudiated obligations of their own free will, will not be hastened by making them the victims of legal jugglery with the Constitution. Other States have repudiated for a period, and later paid in full—notably Minnesota and Virginia. With the rapidly increasing prosperity of the Southern States, and the wealth they are speedily acquiring, these commonwealths may come to see that the wiping away of the moral stain of repudiation is well worth the vast sums which the act would require. Repudiation was utterly without justification; but it was not without such excuse as will appeal to charitable judgment. Those bonds which were issued during the forties and fifties fell due just after the War. The Southern States were not only impoverished; they were filled, as well, with resentment against the Northern classes who held the bonds, and who had, by the abolition of slavery, wiped away that very property which the South had relied upon to enable it to pay these bonds.

Few realize how enormous was the loss in property inflicted upon the Southern States by the War. Taking three States, the following figures show the fall in the value of taxable property:

	Taxable Value in 1860.	Taxable Value in 1870.	Percentage of Depreciation.
Mississippi	$509,472,912	$177,278,880	65
Alabama	432,198,762	155,582,595	64
North Carolina	292,297,602	130,378,190	55

When the State debt was as high as could be carried in 1860, it is obvious that, with a decrease of over one-half the State wealth in 1870, it was simply impossible to continue to carry the debt. Repudiation was not only a temptation; temporarily, at least, it was a necessity.

And the carpet-bag governments, dominated by men who were not natives of the States, and who had no solicitude for their welfare, not only failed to nurse the wounded prosperity of the States and avoid further debt; they actually piled it higher, much higher than could be borne. This very State of North Carolina had in 1860 a State debt of only $9,699,600; by 1870, the carpet-bag government had increased it to $29,000,095.

Moreover, the questionable character of that portion of the debts which was added by the carpet-bag governments has been brought forward—and with much fairness—in extenuation of repudiation. Many, indeed the greater part, of all the repudiated bonds were issued by the reconstruction governments. The scandal and fraud connected with their issue furnished an excuse for repudiation later on, when the carpet-bag governments had left and the Southerners themselves again got control of the Legislatures. Says Mr. Clark Howell:

"For such bonded indebtedness as was fixed on the Southern States by those who overturned both human and divine law to obtain authority which did not exist, and who used the good name and credit of the Southern States by which to obtain money which they poured like water down the channels of their riotous and unceasing demand for pillage and plunder, I do not think that either equity, justice or law should require payment by the States which were so palpably robbed."

Robert P. Porter has thus described the Legislature which issued most of the repudiated bonds of South Carolina:

"The Report of the Joint Investigating Committee on the Public Frauds of South Carolina, a book of 900 pages, is one of the saddest as well as the most disgraceful pages of our history. The House and Senate of a free State were converted into a bar-room, where wines, liquors and cigars were dispensed free of charge. These supplies were absolutely purchased with the State's money, and for a time a reign of carousing and corruption was inaugurated. The most glaring frauds were committed. It is said that an estimate cannot be formed of the amount of wines, liquors and cigars which were used in a single session; but the bills rendered and the pay certificates issued for this kind of indulgence demonstrate that, to have used all that was purchased,

every member of the House and Senate of South Carolina must have consumed one gallon of whiskey per day, with a few extra bottles of ale and wine thrown in, and smoked not less than a dozen cigars within the same time.

"Prior to this time, legislation in South Carolina had been conducted in a rather primitive form, and without the extravagances of wealthier communities. The old legislature had been contented with five-dollar clocks; the new one purchased six-hundred-dollar clocks; forty-cent spittoons soon gave way to eight-dollar cuspidors; four-dollar benches were abolished to give place to two-hundred-dollar crimson plush sofas. The legislator who was contented to serve his State upon a one-dollar seat, in the new era leisurely lounged upon sixty-dollar plush Gothic chairs; eighty-dollar library desks took the place of four-dollar pine tables; cheap matting was taken up and body Brussels substituted."

Nevertheless, in spite of all excuses, it remains true that, as the Legislature of Georgia, before that State itself began repudiating, said, in a resolution which was ordered to be transmitted to the Governors of all the States, to be by them laid before their respective Legislatures: "We regard the slightest breach of plighted faith, public or private, as the evidence of the want of that moral principle upon which all obligations depend; that, when any State in this Union shall refuse to recognize her great seal as the sufficient evidence of her obligation, she shall have forfeited her station in the sisterhood of States, and will no longer be worthy of their confidence or respect."

By all means, the Southern States should, when they find themselves able, pay every cent of their repudiated debt, even that which they, in good faith, look upon as having been saddled upon them by questionable means. But let not payment be hurried by legal juggling. Let not the devious advantage which the debtor took of the Constitution be met by an even more devious abuse of that document on the part of the creditor. Two wrongs do not make a right.

MARK SULLIVAN.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN NAVAL EXPENDITURE.

BY LIEUTENANT CARLYON BELLAIRS, R.N.

We live in an age of mutual insurance, when nations avoid disasters by limiting their liabilities. Risks cannot be avoided, but they can be minimized. To paraphrase a famous saying of Disraeli's, it is the business of statesmen to prevent by policy what war might otherwise effect by force. If there are times when it is wise for diplomacy to remember the maxim of Pascal, that most of the evils of life arise through inability to sit still, there are also tides in the affairs of nations as well as men which, taken at the flood, lead on to success. It is thus Great Britain justifies the Anglo-Japanese agreement. This temporary alliance was an assurance of mutual support so as to prevent the risk of either Power being attacked by more than one hostile nation over a question connected with the future of China or Korea. The essence of a limited alliance is to safeguard the future in peace or war, so that the military forces of both Powers are not called upon to act unless one or the other should be in danger of a great defeat. The abandonment of British claims in Korea had removed a stumbling-block to Anglo-Japanese co-operation. In a similar manner the settlement of the Alaskan boundary question, and the concessions made by Great Britain over the Panama Canal, have considerably improved the relations of Great Britain and the United States. Japan and Great Britain found a common policy in Chinese questions, even as the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race have found one in certain points of International Law, such as the determination that food is not to be regarded as contraband, unless shown, before a lawfully constituted prize-court, to be probably destined for the enemy's armed forces. It is recognized by American statesmen

that they can no longer remain indifferent to questions of oversea trade, now that the value of American exports and imports has risen to over $2,500,000,000. Of $1,400,000,000 of exports in 1903, the United States sent over $700,000,000 to the British Empire, as compared with $77,000,000 for France and $19,000,000 for China. On the other hand, Great Britain cannot do without American foodstuffs and cotton; while the future development of the Empire will largely depend upon American capital. This growing interdependence is significant.

The Anglo-Japanese agreement was signed on January 30th, 1902, because, as stated therein, of "the desire that their common policy should find expression in an international contract of binding validity." After January 30th, 1907, one year's notice may be given of the termination of the treaty. This is a distinct flaw, for it takes over two years to build a battle-ship; and, since the cessation of the alliance means a loss of battle-ship power, the notice required should have been about three years, to enable either nation to augment her naval force. So far as the restraint and conduct of the Japanese are concerned, the confidence of Great Britain has been merited; but it is unlikely that the treaty will be renewed, for it may stand in the way of harmonious relations with the United States, which should naturally be one of the highest ideals of British policy. The risks taken by Great Britain were considerable, owing to the reckless ambitions of the Czar's advisers and the closeness of the ties binding France to Russia. Even so, the authors of the treaty may claim that it kept the conflict within measurable bounds. The Japanese were able to concentrate their whole force on the supreme task of driving the Russians from South Manchuria, as all probability of the sea communications of their army being cut by the navy of France or Germany was discounted by the potential strength of the British fleets in the Mediterranean and Channel. Japanese statesmen were well aware that, given adequate training, their naval operations could be forecasted with as much probability as any business which engages the attention of mankind. Though their naval forces were quite inadequate, if material strength were the only factor to be weighed, it is certain that they did not lose sight of the fact that the Russian Admiralty were attempting a well-nigh impossible feat in endeavoring to train a navy on four months' instruction in the year. It

was evident that the Russian administration was corrupt, and that its foreign policy was not coordinated to the defensive organization, in that its war preparations only matured in 1907, while diplomacy required military assistance in 1904. Just as sea-power was the indispensable condition of the operations of the allies in the Crimea, and of the British army in South Africa, so it has been with the Japanese in this war. If ever, at some future date, the United States should desire to prevent European nations from attacking Brazil or menacing American interests in Syria and China, it could only be effectively done by the use of sea-power previously built up with the most careful forethought and expenditure during a long period of peace. A good example will be found in the German Navy Bill of 1900, involving an additional expenditure during twenty years of nearly $460,000,000. Every detail of the expansion, repair and replacement of ships, men and dockyards, was thought out in advance for each year with due regard to the capacity of the country to bear the expenditure.

That mere population and riches are no match in war against such careful organization, we have seen in the case of Russia. It is only the knowledge that the sea-barrier is impenetrable which will effectually prevent the expanding Teutonic, Slavonic and Latin races of Europe from contemplating aggression on the American continent. If unable to do so singly, nothing but sea-power will prevent them from trying to effect their purpose in combination. They have combined in the past for the partition of Poland. By the Russian declaration of February 26th, 1780, Russia, France, Spain, Holland, Prussia, Sweden and Denmark combined to resist the right of search, and the same Powers were acting together against Great Britain over this question in 1800. In 1807, Great Britain had to break Napoleon's compulsory alliance, framed by the treaty of Tilsit, by seizing eighteen Danish and eight Portuguese battle-ships, and by blockading the Russian battle-ships. Thus a fresh union of over 140 battle-ships was nipped in the bud, but such decisive action could not have been taken had not Great Britain been in the plenitude of her naval strength with 212 battle-ships. We learn that, within a period of twenty-seven years, there were three European alliances of three or more Great Powers against Great Britain, and all were broken up by the operations of sea-power.

France, Germany and Russia combined in 1895 to drive Japan out of China, for what they believed to be their own ultimate benefit; and we know that armed interference was meditated in the American-Spanish war of 1898. If it were urged that the rivalries of Slav and Teuton prevent an effective combination, I might instance from history cases in which statesmen of different nations have thought it the lesser evil to divert a struggle between their countries by exaggerating the mutual difficulties or temptations in another direction. It is sufficient for the present to mention the case of Frederick the Great, who, in 1769, wrote that "Russia is a terrible Power. . . . I foresee no other remedy than in time forming a league of the Great Powers to resist this dangerous torrent." In 1772, he preferred to cooperate with Russia in the first dismemberment of Poland.

It is in their stragetical aspects that naval combinations are to be feared, for they cause the dispersion of the enemy's fleets in order to protect interests which are menaced by the ships of each party to the combination. Tactically, where allied fleets have been combined, they have never been nearly as dangerous as the mere total material force might suggest. Thus, strategically, so great was the dispersion of British battle-ships brought about in 1779 and 1780 by the alliance of the United States, France, Spain and Holland that, on occasions, though Great Britain possessed 133 battle-ships in 1779 and 145 in 1780, she was only able to oppose thirty-six battle-ships in the Channel to sixty-six in the allied fleets of France and Spain, and in 1780 only twenty-one to forty-nine of the allies. Yet so great is the tactical weakness of allied fleets that her opposition was successful. The instability of European alliances is another cause of want of vigor in battle; in the wars from 1793 to 1814, Russia changed sides three times. Again, when Spain "assisted" Great Britain at Toulon, she prevented the complete overthrow of the French naval power; because it was not to the interest of Spain that France should be unduly weakened. Such a consideration could not appeal to an Anglo-Saxon alliance. In addition, it should be mentioned that tactical weakness is much less obvious where language and methods are so identical as in two nations sprung from a common stem, a point to be remembered in considering an Anglo-Saxon combination.

The fact that it is in their strategical aspects that naval coali-

tions are to be feared is of especial importance in the case of a Power circumstanced as is the United States, with her Pacific and Atlantic fleets separated by the coast-line of a whole continent. In the disposition of her fleets the United States could not, under existing conditions, neglect to watch the actions of neutrals. An understanding with Great Britain would be of the utmost value in conferring strategic freedom, for it would enable the United States to apply the first principles of war and concentrate her fleets at the decisive points. Fortified by such an agreement, it ought not again to be necessary to send a telegram to an admiral, as was done to Admiral Sampson, saying: "The matter is left in your discretion, except that the United States armored vessels must not be risked."

I am well aware of the ideal laid down by Washington that "the great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible." In the Monroe declaration, the determination is expressed not to meddle with the internal affairs of other states; and in the Hague Convention the American representatives insisted on the traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in, the political questions or policy or internal administration of any foreign state. The answer is obvious. The independence of the United States would not have been won in the eighteenth century if there had not been an alliance between the United States and European nations, and no subject has been so fruitful of diplomatic entanglement as the extension of commerce, with all the thorny questions of right of search, contraband of war and blockade. Thus the determination of Russia to prevent the opening of new consulates and treaty ports in Manchuria was directly aimed at the United States. The hostility of Germany has been obvious ever since the United States reaffirmed and amplified the Monroe Doctrine, and took an active interest in territorial affairs outside America, as at Samoa, for it should never be forgotten that, since the judgment of the Supreme Court in 1901, the United States has become an Empire as well as a Republic, peopled by subjects as well as citizens.

A different argument to that of Washington is that the United States is self-contained and her external relations are, therefore, of comparative unimportance. She does not, therefore, it is

argued, need a navy to enable her to win success in war. The answer was given by President Roosevelt, in 1902, when he said: "If the navy fails us, then we are doomed to defeat, no matter what may be our material wealth or the high average of our citizenship. It should, therefore, be an object of prime importance for every patriotic American to see that the navy is constantly built up and, above all, is kept at the highest point of efficiency both in *matériel* and in *personnel*." On the plea of self-containment, the Spanish war was a mistake, and the Monroe Doctrine and its recent amplifications are absurdities. To promulgate a law to guard the whole of America and the neutrality of the Panama Canal, and then to refuse to provide necessary police on the sea for these purposes, is to follow the Chinese system of make-believe. In the course of a message to Congress, President Roosevelt said: "We have deliberately made our own certain foreign policies demanding the possession of a first-class navy." He then showed that without an adequate navy the Isthmian canal would be merely a hostage to any stronger Power. The Monroe Doctrine, he declared, was an idle assertion unless the United States could back it by force of arms. "It can be backed up only by a thoroughly strong navy." To refuse the latter was "to invite trouble and, if trouble came, it would insure disaster." Captain Mahan has shown the probability of foreign complications in his "Lessons of the War with Spain":

"There is a large and growing German colony in southern Brazil, and I am credibly informed that there is a distinct effort to divert thither, by means direct or indirect, a considerable part of the emigration which now comes to the United States, and therefore is lost politically to Germany—for she has, of course, no prospect of colonization here. The inference is that the Emperor hopes at a future day, for which he is young enough to wait, to find in southern Brazil a strong German population, which in due time may seek to detach itself; and which may then seek political union with Germany, to obtain support against her former owners and masters. Without advancing any particular opinion as to the advisable geographical limits of the Monroe Doctrine, we may be pretty sure that the American people would resent an act which in our press would be called 'the aggression of a European military monarchy upon the political or territorial rights of an American republic.' This also could be accompanied with the liberal denunciation of William II. which now ornaments our editorial columns; but hard words break no bones, and the practical question would remain, 'What are you going to do about it,' with a navy 'for defence only?'"

In twelve years, the United States' naval expenditure has trebled, while that of Great Britain has doubled; and, in considering the American expenditure, a large proportion of the coming outlay on the Isthmian canal should be regarded as for the navy. Great Britain now annually spends on her navy during peace twice as much as the largest sum she ever devoted to that force during war, and the amount has been increasing at the rate of $9,000,000 a year. These great increases have been brought about in both countries by a definite policy which aims at naval supremacy as against the other maritime Powers. It is such considerations which weighed considerably with the writer when, in association with a lifelong observer and one of the greatest of British naval authorities, Lord Brassey, he undertook a general review of the naval policy of the Powers for the "Encyclopædia Britannica." It was not possible in such a work to indicate a controversial solution which appeared both feasible and reasonable, viz., that the two nations should mutually guarantee each other against a possible alliance of three Powers, so that some limit might be set to the burden of their naval armaments. For, let no patriotic American delude himself into the belief that the present naval expenditure is any measure of what is yet to come. The ships built have to be manned, maintained and replaced. In Great Britain, the past naval programmes have averaged three battle-ships and five cruisers each year, and these will have to be replaced. In the United States the programme averaged about two battle-ships and two cruisers, while, owing to the difficulties of augmenting the navy, some of the ships now building are nearly three years overdue. In Great Britain it is the exception and not the rule for cruisers to last as much as twenty years, notwithstanding that the most expensive repairs are carried out. As for manning, the United States has only commenced to touch the fringe of the question of dealing with a *personnel* costing six times as much per head as that of the German navy. The report of the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in 1901 showed this clearly enough when he wrote:

"It has always been the policy of the Government to regard its regular establishment of the Navy and Army as a nucleus about which a larger establishment would be formed in case of war. The present establishment, however, can no longer be considered as an effective nucleus

for such a purpose. It barely sufficed for the Spanish war; and, were the fleet to be manned with full complements, as it would necessarily be if called upon to fight a first-class European Power, the present *personnel* would barely form one-fourth of the total establishment."

Such a state of affairs is little short of disastrous, for at least one European Power, Germany, is fully alive to the necessity of of a trained naval *personnel* in these days of complicated war vessels.

In 1878, Mr. Gladstone was able to declare that "the strength of England is not to be found in alliances with great military Powers, but it is to be found henceforth in the efficiency and supremacy of her navy—a navy as powerful now as the navies of all Europe." Naval supremacy is, however, based on economic supremacy. Gladstone spoke in a day when Great Britain's economic predominance was uncontested. He urged the necessity for great economy in order to reduce the national debt before the cheap supplies of coal, to which he traced the wealth of Britain, should begin to give out. The total naval expenditure of Great Britain has now risen to over $200,000,000 a year, and the Admiralty have been authoritatively informed that the limit has been reached. In the desire to maintain her policy of avoiding entanglements with the military nations of Europe, it is natural that she should turn to her own kith and kin. The Colonies are not developed enough to help her to the extent of much more than the present one per cent. of her naval outlay; and even so, American capital must play an important part in bringing them to the state of full-grown nations. It is to the westward that the brightest eyes in Great Britain are turning to look for the expected reinforcements. The Prime Minister and the leaders of both parties in the House of Lords, July 27th, 1900, all expressed the view that never in the history of Great Britain has there been such an extraordinary antipathy for her as then existed among the peoples of Europe. Like a storm it arose, and the governments of Europe kept it in check because Great Britain's real foreign minister, a strong navy, was on guard. The lesson was a striking exemplification of the advice De Tocqueville gave to the United States, when he wrote that "experience proves no commercial prosperity can be durable if it cannot be united, in case of need, to naval force." Solon said much the same thing to Crœsus, in pointing out that if another came whose iron was

the stronger he would take away all the gold. But if the iron itself is so costly as to cause the gold to dwindle, then Crœsus must look round for others to share the burden.

The United States is approaching a similar problem. Solon, if he had lived to-day, would have declared that nations struggle both with gold and with iron, and the ceaseless industrial strife is becoming the more exacting of the two wars. Thus money abstracted from the pockets of the people for unproductive military purposes clearly cannot fructify in the industry of the people. In ten years, the expenditure of Great Britain has risen fifty per cent. If, then, there can be identity of interest on the part of the two Anglo-Saxon nations, who both glory in the costlier form of voluntary military service, and who differ from European nations in that they deny their Governments the means of raising revenue by the monopoly of railways, drink or tobacco, is it not possible for them to limit their expenditure by the guarantee of mutual assistance under certain circumstances?

America's path is beset by great dangers, and the disadvantages of waging war both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific are palpable. Cooperation between her fleets can at present only be effected by a transfer like the "Oregon's" famous voyage of 15,000 miles in fifty-nine days. Apparently, American expansion is even less acceptable to Europe than that of the British Empire, owing to the high protective tariff and monopoly of the coasting-trade favored by the United States. Both the Kaiser and the Czar are men in the prime of life, and both are penetrated with the doctrine of Divine Right contained in the declaration of the Monarchs of the Holy Alliance, May 12th, 1821, the words of which are worth recalling:

> "Useful or necessary changes in legislation and in the administration of States ought only to emanate from the free will and the intelligent and well-weighed conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power. . . . Penetrated with this eternal truth, the Sovereigns have not hesitated to proclaim it with frankness and vigor; they have declared that, in respecting the rights and independence of all legitimate power, they regarded as legally null, and as disavowed by the principles which constitute the public right of Europe, all pretended reform operated by revolt and open hostility."

It was Canning who had to urge and insist that the United States was threatened by this declaration of the three monarchs,

and by the actions of France. The Monroe Doctrine, which was then promulgated, was aimed both at Russian ideas of sovereignty in America and at the intervention of the Holy Alliance in the Spanish colonies. In each case the United States was assured of the support of Great Britain, though she failed in attracting British adhesion to the view that future settlements could not be established, as in past times, in unoccupied territories. So far as material interests were at stake, it must be acknowledged that the ability to prevent joint European action in the Spanish colonies lay chiefly in the support of the British fleets, which, throughout the period when the Holy Alliance was plotting, numbered 131 to 145 battle-ships. Would not a similar cause prevent a like coalition from operating to-day? Briefly, my definite proposal is that the United States and Great Britain, having found that their policies are identical and that neither Power can be successfully attacked except from the sea, should jointly agree to come to each other's assistance in the event of either Power being threatened by a coalition of three maritime Powers. The nations under this heading are France, Germany, Italy, Russia and Japan. A special clause should exclude Japan until January 30th, 1908. The agreement should be terminable at three years' notice. While such an agreement does not constitute the open alliance once advocated in this REVIEW, it would undoubtedly be a desirable insurance, and would confer future benefit on both countries by arresting the growth of naval expenditure. The proposal is agreeable to the spirit of what Jefferson wrote in 1823:

"Great Britain is the nation that can do us most harm of any one, or all, on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her we should most sedulously nourish a cordial friendship; and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more side by side in the same cause—not that I would purchase even her amity by taking part in her wars."

The concluding caution was needed in view of the policy of meddlesome interference once pursued by Great Britain in European affairs, a policy now happily recognized as impossible in the future. The above advice was given by the ex-President to President Monroe, when the latter consulted him as to the issue of the famous Doctrine, which, as Monroe stated in his letter to Jefferson, was only issued in America and not in England, in order

to prevent the irritation in Europe which such a step would cause because of "our union with her (Great Britain) being marked."

President Roosevelt in all his messages and speeches mentions only a war with one Power; but Jefferson, who knew European diplomacy well, saw clearly that the real danger lay in a combination of Powers. Thus President Roosevelt said in 1902:

"If we are not prepared to back up words by deeds, it is far better to omit the words. I believe in the Monroe Doctrine with all my heart. I believe in asserting it, because I believe the American people are willing to back it up. But it never can be backed up by words alone. If it became to the interest of some great Power to violate it, most assuredly that great Power would do so, if it thought that we could only bluster and threaten, or if it was believed our force was too weak to be formidable in a fight. A good navy is absolutely essential, if we intend to treat the Monroe Doctrine as we should treat it, that is, as the cardinal feature of our foreign policy."

If now we substitute the word "Powers" for "Power," we see how stupendous would be the task before the United States with her fleets so widely separated by the coast-line of a continent. The solution lies now in British aid, as it did in 1823. Over twenty years before, Jefferson had written:

"The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence that is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of two nations, who, in conjunction, can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation."

The words are as true to-day concerning a combination of Powers, with Germany at their head, as they were in 1802 concerning France. It is not for show purposes that the German navy has expanded in fifty years from a single corvette and two gunboats to the present large and homogeneous fleet concentrated in one mass at its own home dockyards. Germany now has one-fourth of her population dependent on foreign food. The nation grows at a rate of seven millions in ten years. She sees that her sons are lost to her by emigration. Such colonies as she possesses offer no future careers, for their trade is only equal to the total cost of government. The temptation, therefore, to intrigue in Brazil, Syria and China is well-nigh irresistible; and in the future, as in 1898, America's difficulty will be Germany's opportunity. It was even as with France, in 1864, when Napoleon

III. hoped to found a new Empire in Mexico under cover of Maximilian's rule.

There is a strategy in diplomacy as well as in war which is known as the "double objective," and it is so called from the fact that, until the eve of striking the blow, little is known to the victim from which of two directions it will come. Napoleon played it off successfully up to a point, in connection with his schemes for the invasion of England. The Emperor William dangles Great Britain so persistently before his Parliament, when pleading for the navy, as to prompt the suspicion that the real objective may be America. The whole scheme falls to the ground if the United States and Great Britain are united. Now neither of the two nations can hope to command the sea, against the rest of the world, in all the coming years; and ominous protests, on the part of Democrats in America and a section of the Liberal party in Great Britain, against naval expenditure, are already being heard, in spite of the fact that several European navies reach their maximum expansion in 1908. The Titanic task which is beyond their powers singly might be borne with ease if they were partners. Alliance is dictated by common prudence, for the defeat of either Power on the sea would cause a grave financial crisis, and cut off producers from consumers in a great cotton, provision and cereal market. The monopoly of maritime war now belongs to seven Powers. If Great Britain and the United States mutually insure themselves against a war with three or more of the remaining five, the old game of coalitions will forever be stopped. The other Powers may be neglected, for either their geographical or their economical position is an absolute bar to any rivalry.

For the cost of one battle-ship of to-day Great Britain could have placed in line at the battle of the Nile twice as many as were actually present under Nelson. Hence to-day the vital difference is that the industrial factors, in furnishing the sinews of war, are controlling forces of the situation. The proposed alliance offers facilities to shipping along 61,000 miles of coast as compared with 13,000 for France and Germany, and another 18,000, mostly icebound, for Russia. The two countries consumed nearly 50,000,000 metric tons of iron, in 1902, as compared with less than 33,000,000 for France, Germany and Russia. They produced twenty-six million tons of pig-iron, as compared

with about thirteen million tons for the three nations, and over twenty-two million tons of steel as compared with nine million tons. They control the banking operations of the world. They have the complete monopoly of the smokeless-coal supply. No less than seventy-two per cent. of the world's coal-supply in 1903 was controlled by the two nations. The United States has the virtual monopoly of the cotton, and the British Empire of the world's wool, supply. While these and numerous other material advantages exist, there is increasing evidence of individuals having anticipated the Governments in the matter of partnerships. The Governments can stimulate these partnerships by extending the boons of cheap postage and telegraphy, and by facilitating the transfer of money and securities. Since 1815 the United Kingdom has sent nearly fifteen millions of her population into North America. No political question divides the United States and Great Britain. Indeed, the United States is now lending money to develop the British Empire and so hastening on the day when the burden of armaments may be still further distributed, for the Colonies will be able to contribute more than the present one per cent. of Great Britain's naval outlay.

My proposal for a limited alliance has been dealt with in this article as a business proposition. I have done so because in a good cause sentiment is an excess. At the proper time, in the stress of difficulties, the sailors of both countries, who are the frontier diplomatists, have used words such as those of Commodore Josiah Tattnall, and their English "Hurrahs" have rung out for each other in the teeth of the hurricane at Samoa. Those are hallowed memories, showing that separation only came to cement us closer together; closer than when we owed allegiance to one King and one Parliament, and our united navy wrested America from the domination of France and Spain. Therefore, I feel certain that when in need of each other the Anglo-Saxons will march together. So long, however, as prevention is better than cure, so long must it be true that the agreement which would have prevented a war is better than the assistance which averts a defeat.

CARLYON BELLAIRS.

THE IRISH MUSE.—II.

BY FIONA MACLEOD.

"Poor people, they have nothing to think about," said a Highland fisherman to me once, after his return from a visit to London at the laird's expense, at the time of the Fisheries Exhibition. That was the final impression of the Londoners that this island Gael brought away with him: a people far more distraction-seeking and distracted than any he had known or indeed imagined, but so preoccupied with idle and momentary things that, as he said with kindly commiseration, "poor people, they have nothing to think about." The wind, the sea, the sky, the travelling cloud and the untravelling hill, these ministers of thought, so familiar, so inseparable from his whole inward life, were nothing to this people who instead had newspapers, and too many books, and continual rumor. And for the Anglo-Celtic writer it is surely evident that for him the habit of mind of the "ignorant" islander is an immeasurably better habit of the mind than the hurried and fragmentary habit of mind of the Londoner and his kind.

On the all-important subject of nationality I am glad to find so admired and influential a critic as Mr. Stopford Brooke explicit. "Right or wrong," he says, "nationality is the deepest thing in Ireland, and it is a multitudinous absurdity for England to try to ignore it. Even if it were wrong, as it is not, all laws or any government which do not take it into the highest consideration are bound to fail dismally in Ireland. It stands also to reason that, if Irish nationality be so deep a thing, the Irish nature which ignores it is bound to be inferior, in life and originality, to that which is inspired by it. And such is the case. The Irish poetry which follows the English tradition too often wears an imitative look, languishes into subtleties, or dreams into commonplace. Were it possible that Irish literature should be

Anglicized, there would soon be no literature worth the name in Ireland."

Mr. Brooke rightly puts it again when he says: "The only questions Art asks are: 'Is it well done? Was it worth the doing?'" It depends on how we come to the Irish Muse, as revealed to us in this "Treasury," whether we can say of modern Irish poetry as a whole that it appears worth the doing and to be well done, in the high sense where worth in effort and achievement is definitely in the sphere of art. With any other worth of effort and achievement we have nothing to do at present, for we are not considering the spontaneous songs and rude threnodies of a people, but the shaped and colored beauty in verse of the conscious servants of the Irish Muse.

The editors of this anthology admit at once that they found they could not compile a book of a relatively high standard of excellence that would also be adequately representative. They have separated their collection into six books, which, though they unavoidably overlap, are genuine and not arbitrary sections. But a more definite division suggests itself: Irish poetry (that is, Irish poetry in English) before Mangan and Ferguson, and Irish poetry after Mangan and Ferguson.

True, there were real and fine poets before Ferguson touched the epic note or Mangan gave to the too facile Irish lyric a steadfast pulse of flame. The familiar name of Thomas Moore will occur at once. So admirable in its combined insight and justice is the criticism of Mr. Brooke that I do not scruple to excerpt its essential part from the context, and the more readily as English critics habitually misplace Moore, ranking him either too high or too low, and either as an English poet with Byron and Scott or as a typical Irish poet, whereas he is neither to be ranked with Byron and Scott (as for the claim that he is the Burns of Ireland, it is not worth discussion) as a writer of English verse, nor as an Irish poet in the sense in which Mangan, Samuel Ferguson and their successors are Irish poets. "Moore," writes Mr. Brooke, "is neither a truly Celtic nor a truly English poet. The deep things in the Irish nature were not in him. No mysticism made him dream; no hunger for the spiritual world beset him; no fairyland, sometimes gracious, but chiefly terrible, was more real to him than the breathing world. No sadness without a known cause, no joy whose source was uncomprehended, influenced him. Nature did

not speak to him of dreadful and obscure powers, or of beauty and love and eternal youth beyond mortal reach, but not beyond immortal desire. The love of his country was no passion. None of these Celtic elements belonged to him, and they and others are at the roots of Celtic imagination. Nor did he replace them by the elements of English imagination. His poetry is no more English than Irish in character. It does not grow naturally out of the tree of English poetry; it is a graft upon it. He does not descend from any poetical ancestors in England, and he has had no influence on any of the English poets that followed him. He stands, as I have said, curiously alone. Had he had imagination, he would have been in brotherhood with either English, Scottish, or Irish poets. But he is a curious instance of a poet who never, save perhaps in one or two songs, deviates into imaginative work. On the other hand, he is a master in fancy, a poet so full of that power which plays with grace and brightness on the surface of Nature and man, but which never penetrates, that few if any have ever showed so well what fancy could do, when quite alone, and enjoying herself, apart from her nobler sister, imagination."

Moore had two contemporaries, an obscure Irish clergyman and a misanthropic Ulsterman who drifted to an unregarded life in London, who touched a higher note both in "occasional" and, even, in fanciful poetry than we ever achieved or even approached. Charles Wolfe may be but a name to thousands, but the whole Anglo-Celtic world in both hemispheres is familiar with that solemn, simple, and moving dirge, "The Burial of Sir John Moore." After reading, wholly unaffected by even a dim poetic echo, each of Mr. Brooke's selections from Thomas Moore, I turned to Wolfe's "Lines Written to Music," and found there, though they are not of the rarer kinds of lyric verse, a charm and air of beauty foreign to the facile muse of the more celebrated poet:

> "If I had thought thou couldst have died
> I might not weep for thee;
> But I forgot, when by thy side,
> That thou couldst mortal be."

How different the note of simplicity and sincerity here to those other lines, "On Music," with their tawdry ornamentalism:

> "Like the gale that sighs along
> Beds of oriental flowers

Is the grateful breath of song
That once was heard in happier hours."

Still more remote from Moore is George Darley, a poet of genius, of a powerful and extraordinary imagination, but of an imagination so uncontrolled in its highest service and so disordered in its worst tyranny that Darley must of necessity remain a name for the few only, and these even must look into the wilderness of his strange verse as travellers upon a spellbound and perilous waste which, through distorted cactus and agave, reveals scattered oases of a ravishing beauty or sombre flame-like splendor. We cannot even imagine Moore writing verse (to leave aside the obscurities of "Nepenthe" or the too involved fairy-world delicacies of "Sylvia") such as "The Hymn to the Sun," with its titanic imagery; or the sounding quatrains of "The Fallen Star" —the star that had sat upon his orb of fire for flaming ages; or that most unconventional love-poem on womanly beauty, called "True Loveliness," with its bitter note:

"He who the Siren's hair would win
Is mostly strangled in the tide."

But before Moore, or standing far apart and on the higher if ruggeder slopes—and apart also from that blithe and delightful band of light-hearted singers of the humorous, so sane and sweet and justly loved, from Samuel Lover and Charles Lever and Francis Mahony to Alfred Perceval Graves, who, it may be added, has written the finest modern lullaby—are others better deserving our memory, though without a fraction of Moore's foreign renown. The anonymous balladists, too, have given Ireland many compositions which are, perhaps, the more treasured as they are rather the rude voice of the national life than the woven verse of any single poet. To these, perhaps, adequate justice has not been done. Again, there has been undue deprecation and ignoring, on one side of the Irish Sea at least, of the poets who chanted under the banner of Thomas Davis.

For myself, I find an abiding and strong emotion in the upwelling songs and ballads of the poets of "The Nation." These may not have the beauty of art become conscious and masterly, but they have the beauty of emotional life become rhythmic and persuasive. Poland and Ireland have given to the world the most passionately ardent hymns, as well as the saddest dirges of modern

times. Every time I reread these poems of the group known as "The poets of 'The Nation'" I am deeply moved, not only by their burning patriotism and their high and pure spiritual emotion, but by the genuine poetic flame which burns behind their generally somewhat crude and conventional art. Carleton, Gerald Griffin, Callanan, Edward Walsh, who come a little earlier, are poets who, to-day, with the wild turbulence of their period grown quiet (though through depth not waste of national resolve, it may be), and with a careful art such as is now more possible for the Irish poet, might stand in the front rank of Celtic singers. Among all the men and women who formed the group of "The Nation," under the beloved leadership of Thomas Davis, himself truly a remarkable poet, there is none who had not a real faculty. Munster will not forget the boy-poet who wrote "The Munster War-Song," nor Tipperary the exiled Mary Kelly who made the name of "the honey-sweet land" fragrant for all its sons and daughters: the "rebels of Cork" will remember Michael Barry's chant of "The Sword" as long as there is a "rebel" left, burning to redress the wrong. For generations, Geoghegan's "After Aughrim" will be sung or recited by the Irish Jacobites—for the "Jacobitism" which is but another name for the beauty of a great idea lives yet, and deeply, in the Irish as in the Scottish Gael. As for Gavan Duffy and Thomas Davis, when their names are forgotten, "the green" will be seen no more from Rathlin to Kinsale. It is a great thing to write a poem of flawless beauty; but, were I Irish, I would rather have written Davis's noble "Stanzas on Nationality"—the noblest "Flag of Freedom" hymn in any language—than the most flawless music of later song. No patriot, Irish or English or of any land, could wish a better thing than that these noble, lofty, and grandly temperate lines should become the heart-song and inspiration of the younger generations. The poem has the anthem-music of moral greatness. Its opening lines may one day be the tocsin of freedom, heard from the wastes of Siberia to the cliffs of Moher:

> "A nation's voice, a nation's voice—
> It is a solemn thing!"

In other circumstances, Thomas Davis might have become Ireland's greatest poet. Facile, conventional and hurried, as much of his verse is, it is seldom that the poet does not stand visible

behind the fine and worthy versifier. None but a poet could have created that image in the verses on a peasant girl of Bantry, where her brow gleamed beneath her raven hair like

"A breaker spread white 'neath a shadowy cliff."

One of the few survivors of "The Nation" group, Mr. Martin MacDermot, has written a lyric that may live in future anthologies and in the memories of all who love the lyric muse, his all but perfect "Girl of the Red Mouth," from which I must afford myself the pleasure of quoting two stanzas, the first and last:

"Girl of the red mouth,
Love me! Love me!
Girl of the red mouth
Love me!
'Tis by its curve, I know,
Love fashioneth his bow,
And bends it—ah, even so!
Oh, girl of the red mouth, love me!

"Girl of the low voice,
Love me! Love me!
Girl of the sweet voice
Love me!
Like the echo of a bell,—
Like the bubbling of a well—
Sweeter! Love within doth dwell,—
Oh, girl of the low voice, love me!"

Poets whose strains may still catch, if they do not charm, the listener are also to be found among the group who come immediately after that of "The Nation," from Lady Wilde to Fanny Parnell. There is extant a wonderful little cavalier song by Sheridan Le Fanu, by which the admirers of that remarkable romancist will be sorry not to see him represented. Ireland will long remember John Walsh, who wrote "Drimin Donn Dilis," one of the sad strains of eviction-literature; and the young patriot, John Keegan Casey (whose touch of genius and tragic end in gaol, while still a youth, have given him the glory of a fixed star in the firmament of Irish memories and ideals) will always be associated with the thrilling Fenian lyric "The Rising of the Moon," and with the Burns-like love-song to "Maire my girl." Francis O'Donnell's "Spinning Song" is deservedly popular, and

in America is ranked with the most loved home-poems of Longfellow and Whittier. There is, however, one poet whose work is truly remarkable, and might with controlled power and that faculty of economy in word and phrase, that nurture of the form, which is the technique of verbal art, have become a high possession. But, like George Darley, Thomas Irwin must, as his editor observes, be ranked only as a great but unrealized possibility in modern Irish literature. In his powerful "Stanzas on Cæsar" (from which I excerpt four) there is a note of tragic solemnity which in manner also recalls the "Nineveh" of Rossetti:

"Within the dim museum room,
'Mid dusty marbles, drowned in light,
Black Indian idols, deep-sea bones,
Gods, nymphs, and uncouth skeletons,
One statua of stately height
Shines from an old nook's shifting gloom.

"'Tis he whose name around the earth
Has rolled in History's echoing dreams;
An antique shape of Destiny,
A soul dæmonic, born to be
A king or nothing—moulded forth
From giant Nature's fierce extremes.

"His was a policy like fate
That shapes to-day for future hours;
The sovran foresight his to draw
From crude events their settled law,
To learn the soul, and turn the weight
Of human passions into powers.

"His was the mathematic might
That moulds results from men and things—
The eye that pierces at a glance,
The will that wields all circumstance,
The starlike soul of force and light
That moves etern on tireless wings;"

or his powerful quatrains on Fate, that

"Clothed in equanimity, beholds
A blossom wither or a world decay;"

or those on the old theme of "The Skull," but with an individuality of emotion and expression which forbid the familiar comparison:

"Strange shape! the earth has ruins manifold,
But none with meaning terrible as thine.

"For here beneath this bleak and sterile dome
Did hatred rage, and silent sorrow mourn—
A little world, an infinite spirit's home,
A heaven or hell abandoned and forlorn.

"Here thought on thought arose, like star on star,
And love, deemed deathless, habited; and now
An empty mausoleum, vainer far
Than Cheops' mountain pyramid, art thou."

It is something of the same deep note, wrought in a more intense emotion become tragic, that we find in the closing poem of the first half of this "Treasury of Irish Poetry": the celebrated address to the dreamed-of Ireland that is yet to be, by Fanny Parnell. Through its vibrating passion it has a music and a significance for the Irish people which will never be forgotten.

"Art," says Mr. Stopford Brooke in his admirable Introduction to this Irish Treasury, "Art is pleased with the ballads, war songs, political and humorous poetry, and with the songs of love and of peasant life, but she does not admit them into her inner shrine. It is only quite lately that modern Irish poetry can claim to be fine art. But it has now, in what is called the Celtic Revival, reached that point."

This recent Irish poetry is headed by Mangan and Samuel Ferguson, but it follows more the lead of the latter, for one of its more obvious traits is a return to ancient Gaelic legend, to the well-springs of Gaelic symbolism, beauty, and inspiration. Moreover, not only is the sentiment for Ireland of the Irish poets of to-day attuned to a less passionate note than that which we find in Mangan and Fanny Parnell and Thomas Davis, but all have the consciousness that, in lyric intensity, at least, none can dream to equal or even to approach the "Dark Rosaleen" of Clarence Mangan, in which the flame of the national life, the sob of the national heart-break, the faith of the national soul, culminated in one supreme lyrical outcry.

Mangan's poetry, at its highest, has an intensity that no Irish poet has equalled. But he is never the supreme artist. He had little care for finality in the face and form of his verse: or, perhaps, the "care" was too exacting a strain for one upon whose

frail strength and shattered nerves the burthen of life and the sense of an evil destiny too heavily pressed. As Mr. Lionel Johnson says in his finely sympathetic and interpretative essay—the most admirable piece of prose in this anthology—"dreaming his unattainable and inexpressible dreams, he resigned into the hands of Fate and Chance both his self-control and the control of his art." The whole pathetic story of Clarence Mangan is told in these words. Even in "Dark Rosaleen"—which Mr. Johnson justly calls foremost among the world's poems of inspired patriotism—one encounters an instance of extraordinary blindness to anticlimax: where, after wild but beautiful and apt hyperboles as to what in his impassioned love for "Dark Rosaleen," the Ireland of Heart's Desire, he would do, he adds the almost grotesquely lame climax, "Oh! I could kneel all night in prayer, to heal your many ills." "Gone in the Wind" is truly "a magnificent threnody," but that is not a perfected lyrical poem that can wear so tawdry a line as "Raving of knowledge—and Satan so busy to blind." Mangan is finest when most Irish, and no Gael at least could read unthrilled "O'Hussey's Ode to The Maguire" or the "Lament for the Princes of Tir-Owen and Tir-Connell." The contrast between detailed description and that synthesis in music and nomenclature, which only the masters have, may be instanced by a few lines from the last-named poem. Read, first, for example, the often quoted and much admired "Wicklow Scene from the Summit of Lugnaquilla" by Mr. Savage Armstrong—so excellent in its kind—and then these few lines:

> "Beside the wave, in Donegal,
> In Antrim's glen or fair Dromore,
> Or Killillee,
> Or where the sunny waters fall
> At Assaroe, near Erna's shore,
> This could not be."

One could not recall a line of the former after the book was laid aside, but one does not, cannot, forget "Beside the wave, in Donegal" or "Where the sunny waters fall at Assaroe."

If there is little lyric magic of this kind in the poetry of Samuel Ferguson, there is the magic of a splendid and epical Celtic imagination. But he, too, could paint with magic brush, or recreate the visible world through magic sound, as in that marvel-

lous vision of the sea and the coasts from a great headland in "Congal," "the wide pale-heaving floor crisped by a curling wind," with its "slant cerulean-skirted showers," with "a drowsy sound heard inward," among the high grassy solitudes "thronged by the mountain-mottling sheep." "Congal," "Deirdrê," "The Naming of Cuchullin" and "The Lays of the Red Branch" have redirected the stream of contemporary Irish genius. At base, that genius has more in common with the titanic and shadowy and terrible imagery of "Congal" than with the blithe and rollicking strains which are commonly supposed to be almost exclusively characteristic of the Irish Gael. It is no exaggeration to say that the so-called Celtic Revival owes its impetus and early nurture to Samuel Ferguson, and in a secondary but very real degree to the eloquent pen of Standish O'Grady. These pioneers, with Eugene O'Curry, S. Hayes O'Grady and others, including Whitley Stokes, Kuno Meyer, Dr. George Henderson, have prepared a soil whence has already arisen some of the fairest, and whence will yet arise the loveliest and finest, flowering of the Irish genius. To Ferguson, indeed, even the foremost Irish metricist of to-day owes much in his own technique. The magic cadence of "The Lake Isle of Innisfree" is clearly a conscious or unconscious reminiscence of the delicate music of Ferguson's "Fairy Thorn":

> "They're glancing through the glimmer of the quiet eve,
> Away in milky wavings of neck and ankle bare;
> The heavy-sliding stream in its sleepy song they leave,
> And the crags in the ghostly air."

After Ferguson, Irish poetry divides into the verse which follows the English tradition in manner, but is still inspired by Celtic themes, and that which is too strongly animated by an emotion not English either in itself or its source to be called other than the admittedly vague "Celtic," or the awkward Anglo-Gaelic—the poetry of the Celtic Revival. In other words, the effort of the Gaelic Muse to remember, to feel, to sing as the Gaelic Muse and not as the English Muse; but, in this effort, to seek a rare, and if possible perfected, art, in the noblest of modern languages, a supreme tongue now, and, for all of us of the homelands a common and equal right, so that Kent can no more claim it than Cantyre, or Devon than Donegal.

There is another group, but hardly worthy of much attention:

the group of those who belong to the first main section, but are as English in sentiment and interests as in the literary conventions they follow but do not illuminate. These are simply camp-followers, who happen to have been born in "West Britain."

In the first group the most eminent name is that of Aubrey De Vere. Mr. De Vere's poetry has not the epical strength of Ferguson's nor the metrical variety and beauty of that of Mr. Yeats—and modern Irish poetry lies between the "Congal" of Sir Samuel Ferguson and "The Shadowy Waters" of Mr. Yeats—but it is always fine, always the utterance of a poet, and has often a singular beauty and nobility.

I will not, however, add now more than mere mention of living Irish poets. Those who love the Irish Muse know, or will soon or late discover, the verve of those masters of "retelling," Dr. Douglas Hyde and Dr. George Sigerson and Dr. John Todhunter, with whom should be mentioned the younger of the two editors of the "Treasury" himself: or, again, of the delicate, beautiful, and often powerful poetry of the Irishwomen who have added so much fragrance and music to that "dear Eden of our dreams, our Eiré"—Nora Hopper, Katharine Tynan, Dora Sigerson, Moira O'Neill, to mention only the four foremost, and these by the names by which they first became known. If we may judge by her "Songs of the Glens of Antrim," the latest comer, Moira O'Neill, should become one of the most noted of the Celtic group. Her verse is not so strong as Miss Sigerson's (Mrs. Clement Shorter's) at its strongest; nor as exquisitely deft and sunlit and tremulous as that of Katharine Tynan (Mrs. Hinkson) when best inspired, as always, by things pure, tender and by all young life; nor comparable with the penetrating and convincing art of Miss Nora Hopper when that fine poet trusts to her truest inspiration, and controls to a finer service a too facile spontaneity: but there is a quality in these "Songs of the Glens" which is all their own, a quality full of charm, and, what is more rare, distinction. The themes are always homely: the impression conveyed is invariably serene, because satisfying. I consider her "Corrymeela" the finest type of the modern Irish lyric, at once national, local and of a finished art. Moira O'Neill's "Corrymeela," Miss Nora Hopper's "King of Ireland's Son," and Mr. W. B. Yeats's "Isle of Innisfree" might well be advanced as three of the loveliest, as well as the most typical, lyrics of the Irish Muse in our present

day. Among the small group of Catholic poets, there is none who has a higher place than Mr. Lionel Johnson, whose "dæmon" is surely allied to that "Dark Angel" of whom he writes in memorable quatrains, in the sense at least of a controlling genius, sombre and austere. It is a pity that so remarkable a poet should be so inadequately represented as he is in this "Treasury." A kindred though distinct spirit is manifest in the poetry of Mr. Thomas Boyd, whose "Leanán Sidhe" I never read without a quickening pleasure, or without wonder that we have not more from his dreaming and potent imagination.

Of two other of the later poets it is almost needless to write. Mr. George Russell (better known as "A. E.") has published two little books of verse of a beauty so spiritual and poignant that they are, perhaps, even better known and loved now in the England for which he cares so little than in the Ireland to which he has given all the overflow of love and worship from that spiritual Ireland, "The Rose of the World." Of Mr. Yeats there is not as yet anything new to be said. He may not be, though I think he is, the finest artist now using verse as his means of beautiful revelation: there can be little question that his verse, at its best, is on a higher level of beauty than is that of any contemporary. Nevertheless, those of us who thus greatly value his work look beyond anything he has done. His two recent volumes, "The Wind in the Reeds" and "The Shadowy Waters," are intervals: the one where the poet has stopped to listen to an overcoming, fragmentary, aërial music, impossible wholly to capture, impossible for him, for a time, to ignore; the other where he has caught the echo of trampling feet and confused voices, the echo of the drama of life, whether that be the drama of mortal things and material life, or of spiritual things and immortal life. "The Wanderings of Oisín" should be the prelude to a Celtic epic to surpass "Congal" and all else that lies between us and the ancient Gaelic sagas, as "Countess Cathleen" should be a drama leading the way to drama that shall have all the beauty of "The Shadowy Waters," but a humanity as rich and deep and varied as characterizes that Gaelic world of Irish life which Mr. Yeats knows so well and can so well interpret.

There are omissions even in this conscientiously compiled anthology. Perhaps the most regrettable is that of Mr. Herbert Trench, a young Irish poet of exceptional promise.

Lyrics such as "She comes not when Noon is on the Roses," and "Come, Let us make Love Deathless," with its note of tragic beauty, and "Maurya's Song," show that the Irish Muse has a new follower whose name she may yet hold high. In the poem called "The Night," I find a stanza of that magic quality which alone suffices to prove the writer a poet, who has only to perfect his craft to become the rare artist also.

"But she, like sighing forests,
Stole on me—full of rest,
Her hair was like the sea's wave,
Whiteness was in her breast—"
(So does one come at night upon a wall of roses).

If it is from poets such as Mr. Yeats and Mr. George Russell, Miss Nora Hopper and Moira O'Neill, that we look for that which shall most reveal to us the beautiful Gaelic imagination, it will be well for both those who seek and those who sing to bear in mind the wise words of one of the greatest of Irishmen, Thomas Davis:

"Irish nationality must contain and represent all the races of Ireland. It must not be Celtic; it must not be Saxon; it must be Irish. The Brehon law, and the maxims of Westminster—the cloudy and the lightning genius of the Gael, the placid strength of the Sassenach, the marshalling insight of the Norman—a literature which shall exhibit in combination the passions and idioms of all, and which shall equally express our mind in its romantic, its religious, its forensic, and its practical tendencies; finally, a native government, which shall know and rule by the might and right of all, yet yield to the arrogance of none—these are the components of such a nationality."

There are many fine passages on nationality in the writings of Thomas Davis, but none so weighty with truth for those who would serve nobly the Irish Muse as these.

FIONA MACLEOD.

THE SITUATION IN FINLAND.

BY FINLANDER.

Soon after the death of Alexander II., the reactionists obtained the predominating influence in the direction of Russia's home policy. The most influential man among these reactionists was Pobiedonostseff, Procurator-General of the Holy Synod and a member of the Committee of Ministers and of the State Council. Political freedom in his eyes is a most dangerous disease, which is ruining the Western nations. Only an autocratic power can protect its subjects against destructive agitations, and maintain order and discipline among them, to the benefit of all. The spread of knowledge among the masses only leads to misfortune. For the people, the Church should maintain a simple and uncritical belief in dogmas, wrapt in mystic obscurity.

The idea of Russifying all the heterogeneous races under the sceptre of the Tsar by force, was not raised to a maxim of government as long as any interest in a liberal policy of reform still remained alive. But as soon as the reactionary movement began to predominate, it allied itself with the Pan-Russian nationalist tendencies. The government systematically began to smother all manifestations of independent cultural development in the non-Russian nations within the Russian State.

The constitution of the Grand-Duchy of Finland had been solemnly and irrevocably confirmed on the union of the country with Russia in 1809. As Finland, in consequence, had its own legislation, its own government, its home policy, one was justified in assuming that the reactionary and nationalist tendency in Russia would not involve any danger for Finland.

During Alexander II.'s time, Finland had passed through a period of many-sided and intensive progress. In his capacity as Grand-Duke of Finland, the Emperor loyally took up his position

on the foundation of the Finnish Constitution. The organization of the Diet was reformed by a new fundamental law in 1869. Legislation in other directions was extensively developed. The self-government of the communes was adjusted to suit the requirements of the times. Liberty of industry took the place of the antiquated guild-system. The construction of a large system of railways was energetically begun. The gold standard was introduced; the state bank was reformed and placed under the supervision of the Diet; private credit establishments were instituted. Public education was emancipated from the control of the Church; the primary schools were thoroughly and practically organized. All this reforming activity was securely based upon the social order, founded on justice and freedom, that constituted an inheritance from the past centuries in which Finland had been a part of the Swedish State.

This precious inheritance, however, also had its dark side: the community with Swedish political life resulted in the Swedish language becoming the only official language and the language of higher education, although it was only spoken by a minority of the Finnish people. After the separation from Sweden, this had to be remedied. The Finnish language had to get the place due to it in political and intellectual life. The path was prepared by devoted work for the growth of the Finnish language and literature, and the foundation of this reform, too, had been laid during the reign of Alexander II.—according to the principle of equal rights, in point of language, for both the nationalities, Finnish and Swedish, that together make up the politically united people of Finland. Finally, it may be mentioned that the Finnish Diet, on Alexander II.'s proposition, passed a law in 1878 constituting universal service as the basis of the Finnish military system.

Alexander III., as Grand-Duke of Finland, followed the same policy as his father during the greater part of his reign. The Diet, which, according to the Law of 1869, is to assemble at least every five years, was convoked every third year. Thus, the joint work of the Government and the Representatives of the People was made easier. The Emperor Grand-Duke, accompanied by his noble-minded consort and his children, frequently visited Finland during the summer. On these journeys, the mode of life led by the Imperial Family was idyllic and free from all ceremony. The monarch had no need to fear those dangers that threatened him

in Russia. A simple and cordial homage was offered him by all classes of society.

But, in those circles of St. Petersburg and Moscow where the retrograde course in Russian policy was laid down, the picture of lawful order, civil liberty and cultured progress that Finland offered was regarded with hostile eyes. In 1881, the Russian press began a campaign, the object of which was to throw suspicion on the loyalty of the Finnish nation, and to create and disseminate the idea that the interests and honor of the Empire demanded the political and national amalgamation of Finland. The leaders of this campaign, which grew in vigor year by year, did not hesitate to employ any expedient to attain their object. Truth, justice and reason were scandalously set aside.

In any case, the claim ought to have been proved that respect for Finland's rights was in conflict with Russia's interests. Such proof has never been offered either by the press or in official documents. But incorrect statements were disseminated, false representations made, and passions stirred. It would lead too far here to quote examples of such biassed and untruthful assertions as were offered to the Russian public through the press in countless numbers. The chief statements which it was attempted to illustrate by means of forged anecdotes or distorted opinions were, that the educated classes in Finland were hostile to Russia, and that the leading Finnish politicians, especially those belonging to the Swedish party, were *Separatists.* The charge of separatism was the one which was most eagerly employed to serve the purpose. It was useless trying to refute such allegations by pointing to the fact that no political party in Finland has ever expressed opinions of a separatist nature. The imputations continued, and the public were finally led to believe that there was some foundation for them.

The first *official* utterances of the policy of amalgamation appeared in 1889. Alexander III. had been persuaded that it was incompatible with Russia's interests for Finland to have a separate system of customs, a separate coinage, and a separate postal establishment; *unity* ought to be effected in these concerns. Committees of Russians and Finns were established to make proposals for such a unification. The Finnish members demonstrated the impossibility of unifying the Finnish monetary system, in which only gold coins are legal tender, and the Russian system of credit

notes, which are not redeemable in metallic currency. It was also proved that the Russian customs tariff was quite unsuitable to Finland, and that the continuance of the customs-frontier between the two countries was necessary even from the point of view of Russia's financial interests, while the excise dues on corn-brandy, beer and tobacco could not be worked in common. The proposals for the unification of coinage and customs fell through. But in June, 1890, a manifesto was issued that decreed that the management of the Finnish postal system should be centred in the Home Office of the Empire. This was opposed to the Constitution of Finland, according to which all State institutions must be subject to the Finnish government. Another violation of the fundamental law occurred in 1891, when it was ordained that the posts of officials at the Finnish Secretariate of State at St. Petersburg, and at the Governor-General's Secretary's office at Helsingfors, were to be filled, not only by Finns, but also by Russians.

Finland's Constitution is not summed up in a single fundamental law or charter. It is contained in two chief laws: the Form of Government, and the law on the organization of the representation of the people. The last named was reformed by means of a fundamental law promulgated in 1869, called the "Law of the Diet." The Form of Government of 1772 had, in the course of time, been altered in certain respects by partial legislative measures. To remodel that part of the Constitution by means of a codification was of importance for giving its interpretation perfect clearness. By order of the Emperor, a scheme for a codified fundamental law was drawn up by the Finnish Senate and submitted to the Emperor in 1891, with the request that it might be referred to the Diet for examination.

There was, therefore, absolutely no question here of political reforms that could affect the power of the monarch, nor of any change in the relation of the Grand-Duchy towards the Empire, but only of a *formal* remodelling of the above-mentioned part of the Finnish Constitution. Nevertheless, Russian statesmen of the anti-Finnish party set about meddling in the matter. They feared lest the political position of Finland should gain increased clearness and firmness if the new fundamental law were passed. And it was therefore so arranged that the Emperor entrusted a committee of Russian and Finnish statesmen with the examination of the Senate's proposal, before taking it up himself for consideration.

The five Russian members of this committee succeeded in carrying their point against the four Finnish members, *i. e.*, that the committee should not enter into an examination of the Senate's proposal, but should first take up an entirely new question for discussion, namely, the establishment of a new plan for the issuing of laws common to the Empire and the Grand-Duchy in all matters affecting the interests of the two countries. The Russian State-Council was to be the organ that should definitely prepare such legislative matters as were to be submitted to the Emperor's decision. The Finnish members of the committee protested against this proposal, and pointed out that a plan of this sort, that encroached upon the rights of the Finnish Diet, could in no case be carried through without the consent of the Diet. When the proposal for this common legislation was laid before Alexander III., in March, 1893, he appears to have attached importance to this protest, for he resolved that the proposal should not be debated in the Russian State-Council without his special command. But the question of codifying the Form of Government was *also* laid aside at the same time. Early in 1894 the Diet issued an address to the monarch, expressing the firm hope that no legislative steps resulting from the proposals of the majority of the said committee should be taken without due reference to the Diet.

It is probable that this utterance increased the Emperor's scruples about the proposal, and that, before his death, he had himself mentioned these misgivings to his son, the heir-apparent; because, when, in 1895, de Plehve requested the Emperor Nicholas II.'s permission to discuss the matter in council, the latter answered that he did not consider the proposed plan expedient.

When this reply of the Emperor became known in political circles in Finland, it awakened great satisfaction, since by it he had rejected an insidious attempt to undermine the constitutional legislative order in Finland. No fresh threatening clouds appeared on the horizon during the early years of his reign. The Diet met for the first time after his accession in January, 1897. In his speech from the throne, Nicholas II. said among other things: "It is with the greatest satisfaction that I express to you, as representatives of all the Estates of the Finnish people, my gratitude for the staunch fidelity and devotion which this people has always shown to its sovereigns."

But the Pobiedonostseff party continued to brood over the plan

of annihilating Finnish internal independence. An attempt was made, in the first place, to prevent the Imperial couple's journey to Helsingfors, and to instil suspicion into the Emperor's mind as to the loyalty of the Finns. What means were used for this purpose, is only partly known. These intrigues consisted in part of libels against Finnish statesmen, and in part of misrepresentations of the legal questions with regard to Finland's political position. To this were added fine speeches about the Emperor's august mission with respect to the unity of the Empire, from a constitutional as well as a linguistic and national point of view.

By the provisions of the Finnish Military Service act, it appertained to the Russian Minister of War to take cognizance of, and to report to the monarch upon, such matters affecting the Finnish army as did not relate to legislation or to the command of the troops. These last-named matters fell within the province of the Finnish Senate, and were to be reported to the monarch by the Secretary of State for Finland, after the Minister of War had stated his views. In spite of this, proposals as to new laws relating to the Finnish army had been planned at the Russian Ministry of War. Kuropatkin, then Minister of War, prevailed upon the Emperor to summon the Finnish Diet to an extraordinary session in January, 1899, to deal with the so-called "military reform."

The "reform" consisted chiefly in the dissolution of the Finnish army, with the exception of the Guard, the introduction of regulations for military service similar to the Russian, the obligation imposed on the young men of Finland to serve in the Russian ranks. In the proposition to the Diet, it was declared that this change was required by the necessity for unifying the army of the Empire. The reason assigned was but an empty phrase, for the Finnish troops were organized, trained and armed on the same system as the Russian. The real aim of the reform was to make a breach in the institutions of Finland, and to Russify the Finnish youth by means of a military service of several years in Russia.

General Bobrikoff was appointed Governor-General of Finland in the autumn of 1898. He and de Plehve now hit upon the idea of dispensing with the consent of the Diet to the reform. The proposal for common legislation between Russia and Finland, which had been lying since 1893 in the archives of the Russian State-Council, was brought out of its pigeon-hole. The Emperor's frame of mind was no longer the same as formerly. He permitted

a summoning of a secret committee that was to hurry on the final draft of the said proposal. And, on the 15th of February (new style), 1899, a manifesto was issued containing "fundamental statutes for the preparation, revision, and promulgation of laws issued for the Empire, including the Grand-Duchy of Finland."

In the secret committee which drew up the manifesto, legal science was represented by Pobiedonostseff, by the Minister of Justice, by the President of the Law Department in the State Council, and by the Secretary of the Empire, de Plehve. It is surprising that these lawyers did not understand that the Finnish legislative powers, which are organized according to constitutional principles, cannot be brought into cooperation or collaboration with the autocratic legislative power of the Empire. They ought also to have understood that an alteration in Finland's fundamental law, of such a nature that the monarch alone should be empowered to decide upon legal questions, would be a legal nullity, since it was to take place without the consent of the Diet.

Dismay and indignation were aroused everywhere in Finland when the manifesto of February 15th, 1899, was issued. The Senate and the Diet immediately sent a deputation to St. Petersburg, to present to the Emperor a memorial in which the incompatibility of the manifesto with the fundamental laws of Finland was emphasized, and it was requested that such measures might be taken as would render the country secure from any unconstitutional application of the manifesto. The deputation was not received. Citizens from all parts of the country, to the number of 530,000, signed an address to the monarch, expressing the sorrow and anxiety of the people as to the manifesto, and begging that the country's fundamental laws might be respected. The address was sent to St. Petersburg with a deputation of 500 representatives of the different parishes. The deputation was not received.

Meantime, the Diet went on with the examination of the military scheme. They found it impossible to approve of it. The representatives of the Finnish people could not cooperate in the establishment of a law that was to change military service into a punishment of exile for the youth of Finland.

The Diet, when it declined the proposal made by the Russian War Office, resolved to alter the Military Service Bill of 1878 in certain parts, so as to bring it more into conformity with the Russian system, and to increase the country's sacrifices for defence

by doubling the active army on a peace footing. And the Judicial Committee of the Diet drew up a detailed judicial exposition to show that the February manifesto was opposed to the Constitution.

In the address to the monarch, in which the military proposals were replied to, the Diet declared *inter alia:*

"That the manifesto of February 15th, 1899, having been issued in a form differing from that prescribed by the fundamental law, could not have the sanctity of law;

"that no law concerning military service for the inhabitants of Finland can be issued, unless it has been accepted by the Diet, without violating the Finnish Constitution; and

"that the Diet consider it their duty, based upon the highest considerations, to hold fast to the law and the right, which in the year 1809 were solemnly guaranteed to the Finnish people to be irrevocably maintained."

The period of conflict had set in all over Finland. It was and it is not only a conflict between the monarch, who oversteps the constitutional limits of his powers, and the people and its representatives, who endeavor to defend the law. It is a conflict between the Russian power, that illegally and destructively intervenes in the political life of Finland, and the Finnish nation in its entirety fighting for its existence. It is, moreover, a conflict between Eastern despotism and Western principles of justice and love for law-abiding freedom.

But were there then no real reasons, no needs founded upon experience, which required such common legislation as was prescribed in the manifesto?

No; even from a practical point of view such legislative procedure is quite unnecessary. Ever since Finland's union with Russia, a number of questions referring to both countries' mutual interests have been settled in such a way that the proper Russian and Finnish authorities, by means of negotiations, have agreed on the necessary legislative measures, which have been issued in both countries after receiving the monarch's consent. The questions have thus been regulated according to the principles of reciprocity.

After the military question had been dealt with by the Diet, it was, in accordance with the February manifesto, submitted to the Russian State Council. This was at variance with the universal rule, according to which laws have no retroactive effect, least of all laws affecting procedure. As a matter of fact, the military bill, which was already being dealt with by the Diet when the mani-

festo appeared, had been prepared in a different way from that prescribed by the manifesto. In the Russian Council of State, the majority had expressed themselves *against* the War Minister's bill, and acknowledged the Diet's principal objections as justified. Then Kuropatkin, Bobrikoff and de Plehve formed an extraordinary committee, which modified certain parts of the bill prepared by the Diet and the Russian State-Council, and procured the Emperor's sanction to the law which these gentlemen wished to issue. Of course no attention was paid to the Diet's decision. Arbitrariness triumphed.

And this is the only time that the manifesto has been applied. The reason of this is simply that no such questions have arisen as could possibly require joint legislation.

But, one may ask, as the February manifesto has not been applied since then, has it really been such a peril for the Finnish Constitution?

It has been and it is a peril, because the Russian reactionists have considered it to be an official authorization of their endeavor to encroach upon Finland's rights.

The reactionary camarilla succeeded in the autumn of 1889 in getting the Secretary of the Empire, de Plehve, nominated as Secretary of State for Finland. He did not scruple in the least to accept this post, although he knew that his nomination was a breach of Finland's fundamental law. The report of Finnish matters of State was thus entrusted to a man who was not only entirely unacquainted with Finland's laws and national life, but moreover ill-disposed towards the country.

It was declared in the February manifesto that the joint legislation should embrace such laws as touched the interests of both Russia and Finland. Further the manifesto contained the explicit statement that laws relating exclusively to the internal affairs of Finland should continue to be made in accordance with the statutes hitherto in force in the Grand-Duchy. But de Plehve pointed out to the Emperor in a written memorial that the Russian Autocrat's power can in no wise be bound by the laws of conquered Finland. After having gained a willing ear to this doctrine, which with justice has been characterized as "juridical nihilism," he was free, together with his confederate Bobrikoff, to set about the ruin of Finland's institutions.

In June, 1900, an Imperial Manifesto was issued which enacted

that Russian should be the official language of Finland in the higher administration of affairs, instead of the national languages, Finnish and Swedish. This was a violation both of the fundamental law and of the people's national rights. How absurd this was, moreover, from a practical point of view, will be easily understood if one considers that, out of Finland's 2,800,000 inhabitants, only 7,000 speak Russian as their mother tongue. In order to be able to fulfil the provisions of the manifesto, capable officials, who do not know Russian, must be replaced by persons chosen from amongst the small number who have succeeded in learning some Russian, but who are otherwise unqualified for the positions in question. It has now been prescribed that instruction in Russian should be compulsory in the schools.

With respect to the anti-constitutional military law, published in July, 1901, the purpose was not to reform the military system, but to Russify the conscripts. What impression this autocratic measure made was immediately seen by the fact that half a million citizens, in an address to the monarch, declared that the Finnish people could not recognize this law, issued without the consent of the Diet, as valid, and that no one was obliged to conform to it. On account of that, the government have not yet dared to enforce it: hitherto, no recruits have been drafted into the Russian ranks. The authorities have been content so far to summon only those, about 200 in number, who are necessary for filling up the ranks of the Finnish Guard, out of the 25,000 young men who are to be called out annually. This conscription comedy, repeated annually since 1902, has, however, had its deeply tragical side. A number of loyal officials have been dismissed because they refused to assist in carrying out this illegal military decree. Thousands of the conscripts have, for the same reason, refused to let themselves be enrolled, and are therefore suffering various kinds of punishment or persecution.

The organization of the Finnish government has been ruined by transferring to the Governor-General important parts of the right of decision which, according to the principles of the Constitution, ought to belong to the Senate, the incorporated Board of Government. Every prominent and independent man has been removed from the Senate. The Emperor has appointed as their successors such persons as Bobrikoff has recommended.

The independence of the courts of justice was safeguarded by

the irremovability of the judges. This irremovability has been abolished. All the functionaries who have remained faithful to the Constitution have been removed from their posts.

Contrary to the fundamental law, it has been decreed that Russians should be admitted to all employments in Finland. It is no longer even required that they should have any knowledge of the laws of Finland or of the Swedish or Finnish languages. In all government offices where Russians have been appointed, the good order that prevailed before has been disturbed.

According to law, every private citizen had a right to prosecute in a court of law any official who, as such, had violated his rights or done him any injury. This important legal guarantee has been abolished, inasmuch as now the permission of the Governor-General or of other superior authority is required before one is allowed to prosecute an official. The right to form societies for purposes of general utility has been subjected to arbitrary restrictions. The right to discuss matters of public interest at meetings has been made dependent on the permission of the police authorities. The censorship of printed matter which was formerly exercised with liberality has been preposterously aggravated.

The police in Finland used to be a well-regulated, loyal body, which performed its duties conscientiously in the service of order and justice. Now it is a demoralized instrument for political persecutions. The police budget has been largely increased. Moreover, the country has been favored with a strong body of Russian gendarmes, which, for a yearly consideration of 680,000 marks out of the Finnish Treasury, practises espionage and commits acts of violence against peaceful citizens.

The Finns are not an irritable people. Calmness and deliberation, patience and resignation are among their characteristic traits. But to submit without resistance to a tyrannical régime, which cynically tramples on law and justice, would be tantamount to acquiescing in one's own debasement. Resistance was necessary. The prevailing opinion in the matter may be expressed in these sentences: "It is our duty to endeavor to safeguard the laws of the land. In so doing, we must ourselves abide by the principles of law. In resisting tyranny, we must not make use of other than lawful means." In conformity with this, Finnish opposition has expressed itself principally in the refusal, not only of officials, but also of private citizens, to execute ordinances and edicts that are

opposed to the fundamental law or to other laws,—and, in the devoted work of upholding and spreading within the country the love of, and loyalty to, its Constitution. It is easy to see what difficulties this work has encountered, for all public discussion is suppressed. The difficulties have been added to by the existence of a government party, led by such Finns as have considered it to be the wisest policy to yield to the demands of might, in the hope that the monarch might some day change his sentiments, and give Finland back her rights.

Bobrikoff did not understand that ideas are a power that cannot be forcibly coerced. He wanted to put an end to all opposition. He and de Plehve had held out to the Emperor the prospect, that the inoffensive Finnish people would very soon yield to His Majesty's gracious will,—for it would, forsooth, be an honor for this little nation to be amalgamated with the great Russian State, and to come under the control of the mighty autocracy! In order that absolute quiet might soon reign in the country, the only thing necessary was vigorously to check the agitation that was still being carried on by "evil-minded" persons. For this purpose the Governor-General ought to be invested with the unlimited powers of a Dictator. The Emperor agreed to this in a statute of April 3rd, 1903, "as to measures for the maintenance of order in the State and of public peace." It was clear to everybody that this statute ought properly to have been headed a statute "to empower the Governor-General further to disturb order in the State and the public peace by means of the illegal persecution of any one who opposes the revolutionary policy of the Government."

This statute empowered Bobrikoff to make the inhabitants of Finland more intimately acquainted with the fully developed police tyranny as practised in Russia. He interfered with the independence of the Communes by dismissing functionaries elected by them, who had been reported as being faithful to the laws. He sent his gendarmes to force their way into the houses of prominent men, in order to examine, seize, and carry off their papers and books. He got the police to imprison and brutally ill-treat innocent persons with an arbitrariness that had no limits. He exiled about fifty honored citizens for no other reason than that they were looked upon as being disposed to favor the opposition. Bobrikoff's violent goings-on and widespread espionage increased the difficulties of opposition, of course; but it also intensified the ill-feel-

ing and the hatred against those in power. The wounded sense of justice found expression, in the spring of 1904, in mass-meetings of working-people, whose resolutions culminated in the cry, "Down with autocracy, down with Bobrikoff, Plehve, and the Senators"! On June 16th, a young Finnish nobleman discharged his revolver against Bobrikoff. It was the deed of a single person. He at once destroyed himself. He therefore cannot give us a description of the struggles of his soul, and the despair which drove him to take vengeance on the oppressor of his country. And yet even those who maintain that the law is never to be set aside, and who deprecate the political murder, find it hard to judge harshly a deed, the victim of which had so ruthlessly injured the rights of Finland and the vital interests of its people.

If now the question be raised whether Russia has derived advantage and benefit from this new policy which has been so destructive to Finland, the answer cannot be other than decidedly negative. The bond of union has not been strengthened, since the moral factors, respect and trust, without which no political union can have solidity, are destroyed when one of the members illegally and oppressively interferes with the existence of the other. The policy of Russification can attain no other result than a continual irritation, for Finland's people no longer stands on such a low level of culture that it can be denationalized. Russia's economic interests suffer injury when the disturbance of legal order in Finland hinders the economic progress of the country, and thus reduces the sale of Russian products there. And, last but not least, the reputation of the Russian Government has been severely damaged abroad by this policy of violence against Finland. The official world of St. Petersburg has feigned indifference to the severe judgment passed everywhere upon its policy. But, at heart, it has been very painfully impressed by it none the less.

Since it has become known in Finland, during these last years, of what nature the forces are which, under the ægis of autocracy, drive the political machinery in St. Petersburg, we cannot hope for a satisfactory solution of the conflict until an entire change of system has been carried out in Russia. When a method of government, founded on justice, has there taken the place of the arbitrary exercise of power, then Finland may count on due respect being meted out to its Constitution.

FINLANDER.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *November, 1904.*

THE apathy which, except in its closing hours, appeared to mark the public attitude toward the Presidential election even in America amounted in England to something little short of sheer indifference. For this there were several obvious reasons. The campaign, for one thing, seemed to us on this side of the Atlantic singularly unspectacular and, in a sense, singularly unreal. Compared with the elections of 1896 and 1900, it struck Englishmen as lacking both in personal picturesqueness and in public interest. Had Mr. Roosevelt followed Mr. Bryan's example and stumped the country, had Mr. Parker made his oratorical effort six weeks instead of two weeks before polling-day, the contest would have been followed over here with real avidity. As it was, the campaign made next to no appeal to that dramatic sense which every American election is expected to excite. We hoped a good deal from Mr. Parker after his telegram to the St. Louis Convention. It revealed a man where we had suspected nothing but an enigma, and we settled ourselves comfortably in our seats with the expectation of assisting at a vigorous and closely fought struggle. But the aftermath was a disappointment. So far as we could see, Mr. Parker did not improve on his position, as he might and should have done. He won, indeed, and never lost, the respect of all English onlookers as a man of courage, independence and scrupulous regard for the dignities and proprieties of judicial and political life. But until the final moments of the contest, his campaign appeared to lack aggressiveness and decision, and the impression made by his personality grew fainter and fainter. Nor could we see that any issues of public moment either to America or to the world came to the front. The differences between the

two parties, when there were any differences at all, never seemed to amount to more than differences of argument and theory.

Moreover, no British interest was involved in the campaign. In 1896, our concern in the preservation of the gold standard was second only to America's. In 1900, for political as well as sentimental reasons, we could not be indifferent to whatever decision the American people might come to on the general question of Imperialism. Moreover, we had four years ago the eloquence of the American pro-Boers to keep us interested. But this year neither the conduct of the campaign, nor its issue, touched us in any tangible way.

As a nation, we were for once free from the temptation to take sides in American politics. As a nation, we had no preference for Mr. Roosevelt over Mr. Parker or for Mr. Parker over Mr. Roosevelt. As individuals, we could not help having our predilections. Mr. Roosevelt we admire. His character and career, his intense virility and decisiveness in office, have made a deep and genuine impression on British opinion. In his policy we have found much to applaud and little, if anything, to quarrel with; he has seemed to us to rank with the most high-minded and efficient Presidents that America has yet produced. On personal grounds, therefore, and without having anything whatever against Mr. Parker, most Englishmen hoped to see Mr. Roosevelt elected. But they would not have been in the least disconcerted by Mr. Parker's success. On the contrary, they would for some reasons have welcomed it. Those who in this country follow American affairs closely and with knowledge—and, happily, they are growing more numerous every year—have for some time been anxious to rescue Great Britain from the suspicion of being better disposed towards the Republicans than towards the Democrats. It is perfectly true that, for the past decade, we in England have found ourselves more in sympathy with the former party than with the latter. The Republicans preserved the gold standard. It was under a Republican Administration that the United States entered on that course of Imperialism and of international activity which has the heartiest good wishes of the British people. The enormous improvement in Anglo-American relations which the last few years have witnessed has coincided with the presence in Washington of Republican Presidents and Republican Secretaries of State. Moreover, the memory of Mr. Cleveland's Vene-

zuelan message and the irruption of Bryanism have served still further to widen the gulf between England and the Democratic party. In the judgment of Englishmen that party is still tainted with the spirit of Anti-Imperalism and among the rank and file Anglophobia, though only in a passive form, is thought still to obtain. But while Englishmen believe this, they believe also that immediate contact with realities, such as office alone can give, would work a wondrous change in the Democratic attitude. It would make clear to them how thin and sentimental has been their objection to Imperialism, and how impossible it is for them to continue much longer evading the responsibilities of America's new position; and, above all, it would reveal to them that Great Britain is not the friend of this party or of that, but of America as a whole.

It has been a common complaint for years among Americans that Englishmen do not take the trouble to inform themselves on American affairs. I will not say that the accusation, once but too justifiable, has lost all its basis. But I will say that it is rapidly losing it. If Americans will glance over the leading English papers for the past few months, they will, I think, agree that the discussion of the Presidential election has on the whole showed remarkable perseverance, thoroughness and accuracy. I doubt whether they will be able to claim that any General Election in Great Britain has ever been discussed by the American press more fully or with greater knowledge. Some mistakes, of course, there have been, nor, considering the appalling complexities of American politics, could they well have been avoided. But almost without exception they have been mistakes of detail. The general situation and the principal issues have been well grasped and most ably expounded. The days, indeed, have completely gone by when Englishmen were content to remain in ignorance of American affairs. Every paper now seems to have its own American correspondent, and the superstition that New York is the pivot of American life and the only real source of American news, has been outgrown. In the November issues of the great monthly reviews which so admirably instruct British opinion, there appeared no less than eight or nine articles dealing with the personal and political aspects of the late Presidential election. The new interest in all things American, which has sprung up so suddenly all over Europe in the past few years, is nowhere more pervasive

or better informed than in England. This is precisely as it should be. There is no country with which Englishmen feel themselves in closer touch and sympathy. The Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, which is now being negotiated, is not needed if the intention of its framers is to emphasize the cordiality of Anglo-American relations. Those relations have at length reached a stage where any public manifestation of the ties that unite the two countries is superfluous; and such value as the new Arbitration Treaty, if and when ratified, may be expected to possess will be general rather than specific, a contribution to civilization at large rather than an addition of any peculiar importance to the stock of Anglo-American good-will.

It is impossible for an Englishman to touch, however briefly, on Anglo-American relations without thinking of the accomplished lawyer, speaker and diplomat whose good fortune it has been to preside over and to further their improvement. I mean, of course, Mr. Choate. Mr. Choate has now served a longer term as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's than any of his predecessors since the retirement, thirty-five years ago, of Mr. Charles Francis Adams. To mark the occasion the American colony in London has decided to present him, at the annual Thanksgiving-day dinner, with a portrait of himself, painted by Mr. Herkomer, and to place a replica of the portrait in the offices of the Embassy. It is a wholly American affair, the subscribers being restricted to "Americans residing or having interests in England." But though English subscriptions have — very properly, from the standpoint of diplomatic etiquette—been ruled out, there has been nothing to prevent Englishmen from showing their interest in the presentation or their regard for its recipient. I have nowhere seen this interest and regard better or more accurately reproduced than in a recent editorial in the "Morning Post." "Mr. Choate came to us," says this admirable journal, "with a great reputation as a lawyer, a wit, and a brilliantly effective fighter for the purity and freedom of American politics. He has now, in a larger sphere, added immeasurably to his titles to fame by proving himself one of the most popular and capable of diplomatists and a potent and untiring instrument of Anglo-American good-will." After describing the multitudinous demands that are made upon an American Ambassador by society, by literary, philosophical, political, educational institutions and by the

English passion for after-dinner oratory, the "Morning Post" winds up:

"To all these demands and many others Mr. Choate has responded with unwearying kindness and unfailing aptitude. No serious question has arisen between the two countries during his term of office; none need arise during the many years that we still hope to have him with us. . . . But the days have happily gone when the worth of an American Ambassador in London or of a British Ambassador in Washington need be gauged by the standards of merely 'diplomatic' achievements. The social side of both high offices now competes with, if it does not overshadow, their official and diplomatic side, and it is by mingling freely in the life of the nations to which they are accredited that British and American Ambassadors really do their best work in bringing the two countries together. No one whom America has ever sent us has been better qualified than Mr. Choate by temperament, intellectual equipment, and complete mastery of all the arts of social success, to make the most and the best of such conditions. He has established himself as a universal favorite, for his own sake as well as for the sake of the country he comes from; and the presentation which his countrymen in Great Britain are to make him carries with it the affectionate esteem of the entire British people."

Since my last letter England has been nearer to war with Russia than she ever was with France over Fashoda. When the news of the North Sea outrage reached England, two days after it had occurred, the first sensation of the country was one of sheer amazement. As the details poured in, amazement passed into burning indignation, but for fully twenty-four hours afterwards no one, I think, considered it possible that war could be its outcome. The very enormity of the crime seemed in a way to be a guarantee of peace. But when the days passed by and nothing was received from St. Petersburg, except a telegram from the Tsar to the King, which English opinion certainly undervalued, it was quickly realized that war might, after all, be only a question of hours. Men of every shade of political thought rallied instantaneously behind the Government. The Government, almost for the first time in its history, became really representative of the entire country. Opinion concentrated with remarkable speed on four demands—(1) that apologies should be exacted, (2) that prompt and adequate compensation should be made, (3) that those guilty of the outrage should be punished, and (4) that satisfactory guarantees should be forthcoming against the repetition of any such criminal blunder. From one end of Great Britain to the other you would not have found two opinions on the necessity of

making these demands and, if need were, of enforcing them. For three whole days it appeared all but inevitable that they would have to be enforced. When the Russian press began talking as though Admiral Rozhdestvensky had acted in self-defence and as though the fishermen were to blame; when, in particular, the Admiral's own amazing version of the affair came to be circulated; then, indeed, English opinion, outwardly calm and restrained, grew undoubtedly bloodthirsty. The Government did not prepare for war; there was no necessity to; the game was entirely in our hands, and nothing more was needed than the precaution of arranging the concentration or rather the cooperation of the Home, Channel, and Mediterranean fleets. Not a ship was put in commission; it was simply a question of disposing of those already on service to the best advantage. But the activity at the dockyards naturally did nothing to diminish the expectation of war. Even within a few hours of the Russian agreement to the British demands, the bulk of opinion, so far as I could gauge it, inclined to the view that war would come. Popular interest reached an unprecedented height. At the decisive stage of the crisis, the manager of one of the great London daily journals told me that he had spent most of the morning answering prepaid telegrams from all over the country from people he had never seen or heard of, asking for the latest news. In all his experience, which goes back over forty years, he had never known anything like it. It speaks well for English self-possession that public feeling only once got out of hand. That was when the Russian Ambassador, hurrying back to town from the Continent, was "booed" on his arrival in London. Otherwise, the calm of the country might have deceived, and in fact did deceive, those who were not well versed in the national psychology. The relief which greeted Mr. Balfour's announcement of the settlement was the only outward token of the tensity of popular emotion. I will not say that the settlement pleases everybody. There were and are a few who think it insufficient, and whom nothing would have satisfied but the forced return of the Baltic fleet to Cronstadt. But now that its terms are fully known, now that negotiations for putting it into effect are progressing smoothly, the country as a whole is well pleased. The only feature of the British case which might have been omitted was Mr. Balfour's brilliantly scathing analysis of the Russian Admiral's "explanations"—an analysis which was

in effect an attack upon the rectitude of that remarkable seaman. It should have been omitted, not merely because his conduct was *sub judice,* but because it gave the impression that the Admiral himself would be held for examination. When he sailed from Vigo a few days later, leaving behind only four subordinates to represent the Russian case before the Court of Inquiry, it had all the effect of an English diplomatic defeat.

The Anglo-Russian crisis has rather crowded out the Fiscal issue, and the meeting of Conservative Associations at Southampton at the end of October, instead of being engrossed with the tariff question and the relations between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain, was overshadowed by the cloud of war. Nevertheless, the meeting passed resolutions that endorsed all in Mr. Balfour's programme that is acceptable to the Chamberlainites and passed over the remainder in silence. It did nothing to elucidate the quantity or the quality of the Prime Minister's sympathy with his ex-Colonial Secretary's propaganda, but it proved pretty conclusively that the Conservative party is once more a party of Protection and unwilling to call a halt even at the half-way house of Retaliation. That is significant, even if it leaves the question of whether Mr. Balfour is for Mr. Chamberlain or against him as much an open question as ever. Another significant development in the fiscal campaign has been the candidature of Sir John Cockburn for the seat rendered vacant by the death of Sir William Harcourt. Sir John Cockburn is a Colonial, an Australian I believe, who for some years represented his Colony in London as its Agent-General. He was put up by the Chamberlainites as a special spokesman of Colonial opinion, and the local Conservatives adopted him as their candidate with effusion. Like almost all Colonials, Sir John is an intense Radical. There was not a single point of sympathy between himself and his Conservative supporters, except his advocacy of Tariff reform. On the Licensing question, the Education question, the Church Disestablishment question, the Payment of Members question, Home Rule and the Land question, he was utterly opposed to the party for which he was standing. "The interesting experiment," as "The Times" called it, ended in a smashing defeat. So, it is to be hoped, for the honesty of English politics, such experiments will always end. Yet a third incident, not less noteworthy, has been the purchase of "The Standard" by Mr. C. A. Pearson, the

Chairman of the Tariff Reform League. "The Standard" has vastly improved its position within the last eighteen months by refusing to bow the knee to Mr. Chamberlain, and by its unflinching advocacy of Free Trade from the Unionist standpoint. It spoke in a special sense for such men as the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Ritchie, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Lord George Hamilton, and Lord Hugh Cecil. Its capture by the Chamberlainites now leaves London with only one penny paper—and that one an evening paper, the "Westminster Gazette"—to uphold the Free-Trade cause. If one were so foolish or so innocent as to regard London as synonymous with England, and the opinion of the London press as representative of English opinion, the conclusion could hardly be avoided that the return to Protection is assured. But every one who really knows England would at once deny both the premises and the inference drawn from them.

BERLIN, *November, 1904.*

ADMIRAL ROZHDESTVENSKY'S night attack upon defenceless fishermen engaged in the peaceful pursuit of their calling seems to have touched the pulse of outraged humanity throughout the civilized world. With one voice the press of Central Europe, saturated with Anglophobia, and accustomed, as it is, to Russian methods of barbarism, and to political subserviency to that country, branded the execrable outrage off the Dogger Bank as one of the most savage, inexcusable, and unpardonable blunders ever committed on the high seas. People on the Continent were literally astounded at the evasive conduct of the Admiral, who even after the slaughter on that fatal night might still have made honorable amends by putting into Dover, or some other English port, to offer apologies and reparation, but who chose with his rabble crews to make off like a thief in the dark without even deeming it necessary to report the matter to his own Government; at the cynical indifference of the man for human life, for the elementary principles of international comity, common decency and honor; at his mendacity, patent and glaring in every line of his crazy and craven "explanation," extracted from him only at the urgent solicitations of his own Government, which, in turn, was moved to act only through fear that failure to explain and apologize would involve the nation in immediate hostilities. And so, when

the crisis came, all Europe was prepared to hear that the British Navy had been entrusted with the task of exacting retribution. Nevertheless, the peaceful solution of the difficulty was universally welcomed with unfeigned feelings of relief, in which Germany sincerely participated. The tact, patience and diplomatic bearing of the British Government in circumstances of exceptional provocation were not only admitted, but even warmly praised, by the whole Continental press. The announcement that the Russian fleet was to remain at Vigo until the finding of the international Court of inquiry, was acclaimed generally as a great moral victory for England; who, it was contended, by her firm example of forbearance and clemency, had not only established a magnificent precedent for arbitration on all future occasions of strife between nations, but had served the interests of civilization in a highly remarkable manner. All felt that England, with her mighty navy, could have destroyed the Russian fleet in a few hours had the Government so willed it, and all felt that it was only due to the imposing display of naval power that Russia yielded, or compromised, at all. With the feeling of relief that war had been avoided came the feeling of satisfaction that so dangerous a man as the Russian Admiral, who, on his own showing, shot blindly at all craft venturing within his zone of fire, was to be brought to trial to answer for his crime; came, too, gratitude and respect for England's "triumph."

Now all has changed. The departure of the Russian fleet from Vigo created a feeling on the whole Continent of stupefaction and disappointment. Everybody believes that England has once more allowed herself to be duped by Russia, and has made herself rather ridiculous by meekly giving way after so pompous a display of naval power, press rhetoric and beating of drums. The Continent had been led to understand from Mr. Balfour's own words that a portion, at any rate, of the Russian fleet was to be detained at Vigo until redress had been given, and the guilty parties—in this case admittedly the Admiral himself—had been punished, and in that belief had welcomed the solution. But now that the Russian fleet, still under the command of the infamous Admiral, has left Spanish waters, leaving behind as hostages, or scapegoats, four (probably perfectly innocent) subalterns, everybody is asking the pertinent question what all the pother has been about, if that is to be all. Was it for this that

the whole British Navy was mobilized, and the world threatened with war? Would it not have been more dignified to have talked less and done more? And so the foreign press is casting ridicule upon Great Britain. By standing manfully up to Russia England would have re-established her prestige in the eyes of all Europe; as it is, Mr. Balfour, finding that without fighting he could obtain nothing more from Russia, put his pride in his pocket, and decided for peace. Chinese mandarins cut off the heads of a few minor officials when their own heads are in jeopardy, and as life is cheap in Russia some scapegoat, doubtless, will be found; for nobody now believes that condign punishment will ever be meted out to any of the culprits, whatever the finding of the Court may be, and however forcibly represented.

Politically viewed, as in England so on the Continent, opinions vary as to the ultimate wisdom of a peaceful solution. The Socialists are profoundly disappointed that England did not complete the *débâcle* of Russian arms by destroying the Russian navy, and, together with victorious Japan, hasten the advent of progress and reform in the internal administration of Russia. Nor are there serious political voices lacking who maintain that England has thrown away a golden opportunity, that may never occur again, of crushing an enemy with whom she never can live on terms of friendship, and who now, humiliated but not humbled, will abide her time, until, like a wounded panther, she can spring at the throat of her foe.

Meanwhile the personal alliance between the German and the Russian Emperors is growing more and more apparent, and has recently received signal demonstration. By order of the Tsar and the German Emperor, the old arrangement existing in the days when Germany was reinsured to Russia has been renewed—whereby the German military attaché in St. Petersburg and the Russian military attaché in Berlin have been attached to the personal military suites of the Emperors to whose Courts they are respectively accredited. This shows the complete confidence placed by the Russian military authorities in Germany's "benevolent neutrality," and is the first public manifestation of the existence of that alliance between the two Governments which the German semi-official organs have been so zealous in denying. It is no exaggeration to say that it opens a new era in the relations between Germany and Russia, cementing the solidarity of the East

of Europe as opposed to the West, against which, too, it is directed. Nor have Admiral Rozhdestvensky's numerous outrages upon the high seas failed to accentuate that fact. On the one hand, we find France inwardly chafing at the brutal folly of her ally, and actively seeking by skilful mediation to prevent Russia from rushing blindly into war—herself determined not to risk a ship in so base a cause; and, on the other, Germany, reticent and extremely anxious, fearful lest Russia should appeal to her new friend for help—which, in the circumstances, she, too, would have refused. How real was Germany's fear of war and European complications during the crisis may be gauged from her cringing attitude, official and public, towards Russia, when it was discovered that the German trawler, "Sonntag," of Geestemünde, had also been favored with the attentions of Russian quick-firing guns, and had only escaped the fate of the Hull trawler, "Crane," by cutting her nets and making off as speedily as possible. Though the affair was duly reported, the entire German press, which valiantly thundered against the Russians for firing at English ships, for three days suppressed all mention of the insult to their own flag, until the welcome news came from England that a peaceful solution had been arrived at, when the "incident" was casually referred to without the slightest trace of indignation or resentment. Even the Pan-German organs betrayed no umbrage; while the Government not only took no notice whatever, but positively stated that it had no intention of lodging even the mildest of verbal protests with the Russian Government. This lick-spittle attitude was, of course, dictated by purely political considerations, and deservedly earned the gratitude of the Tsar; for there can be no doubt that had Germany associated herself with England, as she has shown herself so willing to do in similar cases in the past where minor States, such as Venezuela, are concerned, and cheap glory without personal danger is preassured, Russia would have found herself in a still more serious predicament. That Germany did not do so, but deliberately contributed to support Russia's already indefensible position, by carefully abstaining from making known or pressing her own claim for reparation, is a point that should be carefully noted, if only because it shows, as the Socialist organ, "*Vorwaerts,*" with grim humor pointed out, that, since Bismarck's day, "We Germans fear God only—and the Tsar."

A few words must be said about the Lippe-Detmold controversy, which, besides being of considerable constitutional and dynastic importance and a unique specimen of a "*querelle Allemande*" in which all Germans take an almost passionate interest, throws an instructive side light upon the character of the German Emperor, and contemporary German history.

On March 20, 1895, the reigning Prince Waldemar of Lippe-Detmold died without issue, thereby necessitating the institution of a Regency, as his legitimate successor, his youngest brother, Alexander, then aged sixty-five, was, and still is, insane. By an edict, promulgated October, 1890, the late Prince Waldemar had nominated, for the office of Regent, Prince Adolphus of Schaumburg-Lippe, a younger brother of the present reigning Prince of that principality, whose family claim to be the nearest agnates to the princely line of Lippe-Detmold, and consequently to be entitled to the ultimate succession to that throne. Now, Prince Adolphus of Schaumburg-Lippe was married to the Emperor's sister, the Princess Victoria of Prussia, having, as it has since transpired, obtained her hand from the Emperor on the express mutual understanding that his family should ultimately secure the Lippe-Detmold succession. And, in accordance with the terms of the edict, Prince Adolphus, in March, 1895, assumed the Regency. Meanwhile, a powerful claimant arose in the person of Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld; and so popular was his claim that, to avoid further friction, with the consent of all parties the question was submitted to a Court of Arbitration composed of six members of the Supreme Court of the Empire, with the late King of Saxony as president. On June 27th, 1897, that Court decided in favor of Lippe-Biesterfeld, despite the contention of the Schaumburg line that the claims of Count Lippe-Biesterfeld were vitiated by the fact that the head of the line, his ancestral grandmother, Modeste von Unruh, had belonged to the "*petite noblesse.*" This decision was considered at the time to be final, and Prince Adolphus had to retire from Detmold, Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld assuming the Regency on July 17th, 1897. Then it was that the Emperor first publicly intervened by means of a telegram in which he said to the retiring Prince Adolphus: "Your Regency has certainly been a blessing. Detmold will never obtain a more worthy lord and lady. Many greetings to Victoria, and my warmest Imperial thanks for the devoted loyalty with

which you administered your office." To this the people of Lippe retorted by a public address to the incoming Regent, saying: "Nobody more worthy can be our sovereign Lord, nobody more worthy our sovereign Lady, then Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld and his illustrious consort." The verdict of the King of Saxony having established the claims of Lippe-Biesterfeld to the succession, the Schaumburg line then challenged the claims of his descendants, on the ground that the wife of the Regent, who was a Countess von Wartensleben, was the daughter of Mathilde Halbach-Bohlen, who was the child of American parents; the point being that the descendants of an American grandmother were not of good enough birth to sit on the throne of a small German state. Thus, owing to the plebeian births, considerably over a hundred years ago, of the ancestral grandmothers on the male and female sides of the Biesterfeld line, the sons of the Regent were alleged to be incapable of ascending the throne. To quash this contention, the Government of Lippe-Detmold, with the consent of the Diet, enacted a law, March 16th, 1898, nominating the eldest son of Count Lippe-Biesterfeld, Count Leopold, legitimate heir to the Regency. In the same year, the Emperor manifested his displeasure in a remarkable fashion. On the Regent complaining to the Emperor that the officers of the garrison of the Principality declined to address his children as "*Erlaucht*" (Serenity), His Majesty replied in a telegram: "Your letter received. Instructions of Commanding General were issued with my approval. To the Regent what is due to the Regent, nothing more. For the rest, I forbid you, once and for all, to address me in the tone which you have seen fit to use towards me."

This telegram aroused widespread indignation in Germany, where it was universally condemned. Then for six years there was a lull in the controversy, until September 26th of this year, when the Regent, Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld, who for nearly thirty years had been a permanent invalid, and during his reign had acquired universal respect and admiration, died, leaving the office of Regent to his son Leopold, a young officer in the German army. In dutiful respect, the son immediately informed the Emperor of the death of his father, and ere nightfall received the following telegraphic reply: "I express my sympathy at the death of your father. As the legal situation is by no means

cleared up, I cannot accept the assumption on your part of the Regency, nor can I permit the soldiers to take the oath of allegiance."

The effect of this singular telegram of condolence was electrical. Apart from its harsh, almost indecent, tone at such a moment, the telegram, which bore the signature "William I. R.," was an unconstitutional act, as all Imperial edicts, to be valid, must be accompanied by the signature of the Chancellor. Moreover, by refusing to allow the troops of the Principality to take the oath of allegiance, the Emperor established an anarchical condition, contrary to all military precedent and constitutional usage; while his description of the legal situation as "not cleared up" denoted nothing more nor less than an arbitrary infringement upon accepted law and authority—namely, the law enacted by the Lippe Government in 1898. Lastly, it flouted the dignity of the Chancellor, who was called upon to resign, or offer explanations. The outcry was so great that the Chancellor, who is an adept in the art of explaining his Imperial master's words and actions, issued what he styled an "authentic interpretation" of the telegram, in which, in bad German, he repudiated the idea that the Emperor intended to interfere, and promised that the Lippe question should be settled on its own merits by the law. With this promise the matter now stands; the son of the Regent, Count Leopold, maintaining the Regency. It now only remains to add that, immediately after the death of the Regent, the Lippe Diet made known the text of a secret agreement, signed in 1886 between Prince Waldemar of Lippe and Prince George of Schaumburg-Lippe, to which all the agnates of the Schaumburg line appended their signatures, whereby, on the demise of Prince Waldemar, Prince Adolphus of Schaumburg-Lippe was to succeed to the Regency. Needless to say, this revelation of the unscrupulousness and duplicity of the Schaumburg line still further alienated sympathy from their cause; and it now looks, as the whole question is to be once more submitted to the decision of a Special Court of the Federal Council, as if the Biesterfeld line, after all, will be adjudicated lawful heirs to the succession. Such, in outline, is the history of the controversy, which Bismarck, as long ago as 1895, declared to be settled in favor of Lippe-Biesterfeld. Germans feel so passionately about it, because they realize that the Emperor has not shrunk from resorting to personal abuse, chicanery,

intrigue, arbitrary and unconstitutional misuse of his sovereign power, in order to harry an infirm, but worthy and enlightened, old Count and his son out of a position assigned to them by law, hereditary right, and popular acclamation, and put his sister and her consort in their place, on the throne of Lippe-Detmold.

ST. PETERSBURG, *November, 1904.*

THE signs of the period are many and ominous, the shadows of coming events dark and weird, for Russia is seething with discontent, burning with shame, tortured by doubt. The peoples who acknowledge the sway of the Tsar are growing, mentally and morally, not by months or weeks, but by days and hours. The scales are falling from their eyes; their consciousness is keener, more intense, their impulse to action is becoming irresistible. From time to time vast multitudes of unwashed, dishevelled, ragged, lean human beings, with no work, no food, no part to play in this world but that of slowly quitting it, rise up wildly and burn the hay, the corn, the houses of the wealthy, especially in the south. Thousands of recruits, with nothing to eat but plenty of alcohol to drink, gut shops, rifle private dwellings, attack the police. Army officers eagerly read seditious pamphlets and forbidden journals, and openly talk "treason," which consists in making a sharp distinction between Russia and her Tsar. Priests prepare for a new era of Church history. Noblemen make common cause with peasants against the caprices of the autocracy, and even courtiers find fault with the dynasty.

In a word, Russia's institutions, political and religious, her social order, her foreign and domestic policy, and even her form of government, are in the crucible, and no man can foretell the shapes which they will assume when they finally emerge thence. Contrasts are extreme to the point of grotesqueness; currents and back-eddies meet, clash and revolve in whirlpools; disorder swells and spreads to the verge of chaos. On one side we see a Government composed of ministers lacking power, initiative, insight and courage, behind whom flit shadowy forms of imperial Grand-Dukes—pullers of the wires which move the entity known as Russia. On the other side, we behold a people bereft of its substance, shorn of its strength, blinded like Samson, and set to grind in its prison house for the support or delectation of the Philistines.

And the likeness between the Russian people and the Hebrew strong man may be further justified by wild happenings in the near future.

Foreigners are bewildered by what they see and hear, and stand puzzled like a country schoolmaster before Egyptian hieroglyphics. For we live in a period of transition. The newspapers are beginning cautiously to condemn the past, to criticise the present, and to claim a voice in ordering the future; yet foreign books, newspapers and reviews are cut, blackened, suppressed by the censor, while the country is flooded with leaflets and proclamations secretly printed and zealously circulated. Literary men meet in private and discuss the coming change of régime; secret conferences are held which resemble the meetings of Girondins and Jacobins in eighteenth-century Paris. Rich men refuse to tax themselves on the demand of the Court, which has not set them an example; just as peasants have to be driven by force from their huts to the barracks, by the order of Grand-Dukes who refuse to quit their palaces. The nation demands peace; the rulers who shun the battlefield order war to the knife, and further insist on hampering the action of the troops. For the operations of army and navy are directed by the "Most High," as the Tsar is officially termed in the jargon of Byzantium, while responsibility for failure is fixed upon the Generals and Admirals who are thus obliged to act against their better judgment. Far from being disconcerted by reverses at the front, the dynasty and its unofficial advisers continue to provoke Great Britain and the United States by arbitrary contraband regulations and murderous attacks on harmless fishermen; while, in the eyes of the thinking section of the people, the myriads of slain and wounded, and the vast crowd of their half-famished brethren slowly dying at home, assume the form of spectral monsters like the ghosts that appeared to Richard III. Such is the condition of Russia as it presents itself from within. Seen from without it is less alarming.

Viewed from that angle of vision, hopes of peace, doubts of victory and rumors of mediation characterize the situation. True, foreign diplomatists and Government journals solemnly assure their hearers and readers that the Tsar's subjects are athirst for vengeance and eager to carry on the struggle to the death. But those who have even a slight acquaintance with the masses know that the contrary is the truth. The Russian people are heartily

sick of the war, which crushes them as no previous campaign ever did. They have had no enthusiasm for it from the outset. For the benighted peasant knows nothing of Manchuria, and feels no impulse to sacrifice the welfare of his family and his own life for the purpose of wresting it from Japan or China. Still, the word of the Tsar was a law to him; and, so long as it was believed that the Russian army would have but to advance in order to drive the enemy before it like sheep, there were few murmurs. But defeat brought reflection, criticism, discontent; and the practical consequences of a long series of retreats opened the eyes of the common man to the fact that it is he and his like who have to bear the brunt of the war, for the sake, not of his fatherland, but of the few privileged personages to whom it is bringing wealth, position, honors and decorations.

For the first time in Russian history the meaning of war has been brought home to the minds of the masses. During the Turkish campaign, its pressure was hardly felt. The law of universal conscription was then only in its embryonic stage, and the contributions of men made by any particular area were quite insignificant. At present, mobilization takes place in vast districts and populous cities, and the men come in crowds wrathful and murmuring. Merchants, officials, clerks, teachers, actors, farmers are summoned from their homes and ordered to cut every tie of kindred, friendship, business, and set out to kill or be killed. There is no discharge in this war. In vain, wives, sisters, brides and daughters fall on their knees in the mud imploring Generals, Privy Councillors and even the Tsar himself, to spare the bread-winner. Fate is not more inexorable. There is only one issue and many take it: suicide. Here, several youths blow their brains out; there, men throw themselves from the upper stories of high houses; in another place, a whole family swallows poison. A few lie down on the rails in front of the trains; many run away; some go mad. Women give birth to dead children in the square where the recruits foregather. Weeping and mourning are universal. Nor is death the worst to be feared. The tortures of the wounded are known to be maddening. Private letters have come from men who lay for forty-eight hours in the field, with festering wounds and parching thirst, forgotten. No wonder that the murmurs of the peasants waxed loud in some places, and became mutiny in others.

Men and priests were sent about the country to fan the embers

of patriotism in the peasant breast. "Our Little Father," they said, "desires to win Manchuria for his children, but the treacherous Japanese are trying to prevent him." But the Russian boors shrewdly made answer: "New land will be useless to us if we lose our lives. There is plenty in Russia, if only we were allowed to till it in peace. As for Manchuria, we know that it is the graveyard of tens of thousands of our brothers. We got on without it under other Tsars, and we do not want it now."

The working-men in cities are still more opposed to the war, for it deals them a much more cruel blow. Even those who are not drafted to the army are thrown out of work and deprived of bread. Of Jews alone, there are over 20,000 men in the Warsaw district in receipt of one pound of dry bread daily from the wealthier members of their community. Other districts of Poland are no better off. And Poland is but a part of the Empire. Those working-men can and do read, and what embitters them most in the newspapers are the oft-repeated boasts of the Government that the available gold reserves are greater now than ever. "The people are famished, while the Autocracy rolls in wealth," they remark. "Autocracy and people are greater enemies than Russia and Japan."

The intelligent classes, too, distinguish between fatherland and dynasty, patriotism and servility; and not without reason. Their best representatives are in fortresses, in prisons, in Siberia or in the coldest parts of northern Russia. Some of them, it is true, have lately been forgiven, but the acts or words for which they were punished are still treated as crimes, and the ex-criminals may at any moment be condemned again without trial or indictment. Their disaffection has already assumed the form of opposition to the war and, very often, of sympathy with Japan. The press has noticed this sentiment and condemned it. Although not surprised myself, I more than once argued the point from curiosity. "After all," I objected, "the Japanese are your enemies; and, if you find anything to admire in them, it can only be their love of country." "Quite so," was the answer I most frequently received. "They have a country, and they love and serve it; whereas we have not. They are fighting for their nation, while we are dying for a group of privileged persons who treat the Russian people as their enemies. The Japanese, being the enemies of our enemies, are therefore in a certain sense our friends."

These feelings, gathering strength as they spread, are being transmuted into popular passion. A section of the press, profiting by the dismay of the Government, gives them utterance, sometimes clearly, emphatically, brutally. Here is a symptomatic instance of plain speaking. Prince Trubetskoy, who occupies a chair in the Imperial University of Kieff, complains that Russia had been sleeping for generations and is now awakened by Japan, who has humiliated her pride and revealed her weakness:

"Who is to blame for that? The Russian people? But the Russian people slept by order of the authorities. And for many years all conceivable measures were adopted to keep them from awakening. When, from time to time, any one seemed about to rise up and speak in a human voice, he was held to be disturbing public order and endangering public safety. And the warning order was heard: 'Silence! Lie quiet!' while a brawny arm thrust down the raised head. For many years past, Russia has resembled a dormitory in a police station."

That is plain speaking with a vengeance, and it is the expression of the thoughts and feelings of nearly a hundred millions.

That the really religious classes in Russia should feel no enthusiasm for the war is only what one would expect. Their kingdom is not of this world. But what is more significant and surprising is that they, too, are in opposition to the Government which continues the war. For they are never immune from persecution, never free to save their souls in their own way. What most of them teach is that God has greater power and, therefore, stronger claims to obedience than the Tsar, and that His behests must be fulfilled whenever they conflict with an Imperial ukase. The Government, discouraging comparisons which set the Tsar below any being—even the Almighty—sends the men who institute such either to prison or to the madhouse.

The most fateful phenomenon of all, however, is the falling away of the Russian merchants. A close caste for many generations, the trading guild still forms a social island in the Tsardom of to-day. Peculiar views, ancient customs, secular traditions, quaint proverbs, distinguish them from every other section of the community. But the one trait which every merchant possessed, and which clung to him even when he lost the religious faith of his fathers, was unbounded devotion to the Tsar, and readiness to spend money generously on any object recommended by his Majesty. But now even the Moscow merchants have buttoned up

their pockets. The recent experience of Morozoff, perhaps the wealthiest merchant in Russia, has been so extensively described in the daily press that I need only say that it illustrates the situation well. The authorities, growing alarmed, inspired the newspapers to shame the merchants into generosity; and articles were published branding the industrial millionaires as "savages," "the progeny of highwaymen," "pirates," and "beasts of prey." But independent journalists made answer that the nabobs of Russia are right. Like the peasants, they are nullities in their fatherland. They pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in direct taxes to the state, they give employment to scores of thousands of workmen, they subscribe enormous sums to hospitals—in a word, they are a force in the country. Yet all the part such a merchant plays is that of a milch cow to the Treasury; and, as the cow is expected to give milk, not to low, so the merchant is expected to pay money down, not to open his mouth even if there be anything wrong and he can set it right. A merchant is not admitted into good society. He is the employer of a hundred impecunious noblemen to whom he pays mere nickels, yet the children of these mendicants are privileged to enter into special high schools and become Ministers of State, while his own children have no such rights. If a merchant's son wants to become a naval officer, he must go to England or Japan.

Even the army and navy, or rather many of their best representatives, are against the war. Why? Because the Government is not giving either service fair play. Admiral Skrydloff may be an admirable commander, despite his unpopularity; but his appointment was the result of a mistake made by a Grand-Duke. General Kuropatkin is not allowed to have any initiative. Each of Kuropatkin's advances against the Japanese was undertaken by orders from St. Petersburg. His celebrated "order of the day" to his soldiers was dictated, word for word, from the capital; and he had to sign it or resign.

All Russia is calling for internal reforms, and the Government answers that there is no money available. The campaign swallows it all up. Already the finances are suffering from the strain; the gold standard is imperilled; the economic condition of the masses is wretched beyond words; and as a direct consequence autocracy itself is in danger. Another serious Russian defeat in Manchuria, together with the fall of Port Arthur, would, I feel

convinced, provoke such a popular resolve to put an end to the meaningless struggle that the Tsar would be obliged to call in representatives of the Zemstvos, and authorize his representatives to open negotiations with Japan with a view to making peace.

But so long as there are victories, real or apparent, to buoy up the hopes of the War Party and to silence the murmurs of the people, peace proposals will not be entertained, nor domestic reforms introduced. For the governing group of Grand-Dukes has learned nothing from the campaign, and forgotten nothing during its progress. There is a new Minister of the Interior, Sviatopolk Mirsky, a smooth-tongued, enlightened and well-meaning man, who is quite ready to comply with the reasonable demands of the people. He has done much to prove his willingness to compromise with the new spirit which now prevails. Thus he connives at outspoken articles in newspapers, and he has pardoned several of the highly respected men whom his predecessor had banished or imprisoned without trial. But, having gone thus far, he has come to a standstill. For he is invested with no power but that of making vague promises and patriotic exhortations. In the two Russian capitals and other cities university students are being arrested and their lodgings searched at night. The army of spies is not only maintained, but increased. The secret body-guard of the Emperor has been more than doubled.

Abroad, too, the old programme is the same. Russia has carried her point of including raw cotton and consignments of metal to Japan in the list of contraband of war. That was a weapon levelled against Japanese industry on the one hand and British and American trade on the other. The pretext is that raw cotton could be employed in the manufacture of guncotton. Everybody in the army knows, however, that a single consignment of raw cotton would suffice to make enough of the explosive to blow up half Russia. But Japan needs cotton for her spindles, which number over a million, and Russia's object is to paralyze that industry. Japan imports metals worth fifteen million dollars, and for American petroleum she pays annually five millions. Out of a total import trade of $131,490,000 some fifty-nine millions' worth is arbitrarily declared contraband.

In the Middle East, Russia is equally active. In spite of the arrangement between her and England, she seems determined to enter into close relations with the Afghans, to "study" their

country, to keep consuls and to obtain exclusive concessions there. Already official proposals have been sent to the Amir, whose reply is silence; they were twice forwarded with no tangible result. Russia is ready to enforce them in other ways; and officials here hint at the line that will be adopted, by instancing Great Britain's action in Tibet.

The animus felt against Great Britain could not be more frankly exhibited than in the unjustifiable attack delivered by Russian warships upon harmless fishermen in the North Sea. If there had been only the two ships which sank, no word of their fate might ever have gone abroad. And what happened to a flotilla in the North Sea may well occur on the high seas to detached ships. High-handed acts like these make one call to mind the massacres of Blagoveshtshensk and of Taku during the Russian Expedition against the Boxers, the cold-blooded shooting of the Japanese troops before their transport was blown out of existence and the sinking of the "Hipsang" and the "Knight Commander."

The mass of the Russian people ought not to be held responsible for those cruelties. They will be discouraged and forbidden whenever the nation becomes arbiter of its own destinies. For injustice at home and abroad is the work of a court camarilla, not of the much-suffering Russian people.

WASHINGTON, *November, 1904.*

WE do not purpose here to discuss from the view-point of internal politics the amazing outcome of the Presidential election —amazing, because Mr. Roosevelt carried not only all the Northern and Western States, but also three of the former Slave States, Delaware, West Virginia and Missouri, besides securing a part of Maryland's electoral votes; but rather to indicate how the result is, and should be, regarded by well-informed and thoughtful men in foreign countries. By way of preface, however, we may glance at two or three incidents of the election, which, although ostensibly relating, not to international, but to domestic affairs, really throw some light upon the question, sure to be mooted in European capitals, whether the Republican triumph is likely to be repeated four years hence. One thing is settled by the self-denying declaration which Mr. Roosevelt made when he learned of his victory: the Republicans will lack in 1908 the ad-

vantage of possessing in their standard-bearer a universally known, picturesque, forceful and magnetic personality. Many things may happen in four years, but the emergence from the Republican ranks of a second Theodore Roosevelt is extremely improbable. The Republican party, therefore, must expect to be judged in the next contest by the record which it makes in the coming quadrennium. With the shaping of that record Mr. Roosevelt will have much to do, but it remains to be seen, and is at present doubtful, whether he will be able to control the Senatorial coterie which is committed to the maintenance of the Dingley tariff. That Mr. Roosevelt was supported by a multitude of revisionists, who believed him at heart disposed to favor a reasonable readjustment of the existing customs duties, seems to have been demonstrated by the returns from Massachusetts, which, largely on the issue of revision, chose a Democratic Governor, although it gave the President its electoral votes. If Mr. Roosevelt's influence shall avail to bring about a genuine revision of the tariff, and if he shall use with vigor and effect against law-breaking trusts the powers vested in him by the Inter-State Commerce act and the supplemental legislation, it is probable that the opposition will be unable to make the next campaign pivot on the Trusts and Tariff issues. In that event the Republican party seems likely to retain ascendency for an extended period, especially if, during the next four years, it should succeed in widening the breach already made in the "Solid South." The startling fact that Missouri was carried by the Republicans suggests that, if Mr. Roosevelt had maintained toward the Southern States the conciliatory policy adopted by his predecessor, there would have been some hope of detaching Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee and Arkansas from the Democratic column. Even in Louisiana, the so-called "Lily-White" Republicans were becoming a formidable organization, when irritation at the Booker Washington, Crum and other similar incidents caused them virtually to disband. In view of the result in Missouri, it is conceivable that Mr. Roosevelt, if he took measures to check the revival of the race issue, might put his party in a position to obtain in 1906 more Representatives from the Southern States than the Democracy could get from the Northern. Under such circumstances, it would be hard to see how the Democrats could look forward to recovering control of the Lower House of the Federal Legislature. That they

cannot regain for many years to come the preponderance in the Senate which they enjoyed for a brief season in Mr. Cleveland's second term is indisputable. They may, on the other hand, count with some confidence on electing a President and a majority of the House of Representatives, if the Republican party's treatment of the Trusts and the Tariff shall fail to satisfy the masses of the people. As regards, in a word, the permanence of the Republican triumph, no forecast is practicable, until we learn what course Mr. Roosevelt will adopt with regard to the two capital issues in internal politics.

The primary grounds of the interest with which our Presidential campaign was watched in Europe and the Far East are obvious: they have to do with our foreign policy, and with our power of enforcing it by naval and military strength, or of promoting it by alliances or friendly understandings. The facts that Mr. Roosevelt will be President for another term, and that Mr. Hay will continue to be his Secretary of State, are, naturally, accepted as guarantees that there will be no divergence from the positions taken by our State Department during the last three years. There has never been any foundation for the campaign charge that Mr. Roosevelt was inclined to entangle the United States in foreign complications. The despatch of warships to San Domingo, to Tangiers, to Beirut and to Smyrna was a legitimate means of exerting pressure upon delinquent and refractory States which had paid no heed to the diplomatic presentation of just demands. What is our navy for, if not to assure considerate and equitable treatment to our citizens in foreign parts? Unquestionably, Mr. Roosevelt has had more than one pretext for involving us in international imbroglios. He has availed himself of none of them. Our attitude toward China in the matter of the indemnity exacted for the Boxer outrages was a model of forbearance and disinterestedness. There is reason to believe that, but for the influence exerted by our State Department, the indemnity would have been materially larger and the terms of payment more onerous. It is now tolerably certain that, had an inordinate amount of money been claimed from China, the Pekin Government would have renounced the hope of paying it, and the Powers concerned would have found themselves confronted with a revolution throughout the Middle Kingdom. Great Britain would gladly have seen our State Department a

party to the treaty by which England bound herself to assist Japan in certain contingencies. Some specious reasons might have been advanced for such participation on our part: for instance, through our possession of the Philippines we have become an Asiatic Power, and, as such, we were interested in averting the outbreak of war in the Far East. Moreover, had our Government become a signatory of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, it is improbable that Russia would have defied Japan. As a matter of fact, the United States have remained scrupulously neutral in the contest which began last February, and the end of which is problematical. Again, President Roosevelt was invited to act as umpire in the dispute between Venezuela and the three blockading Powers, and also to decide the question whether, in the distribution of Venezuelan revenues, set aside for the payment of foreign debts, a preference should be given to countries which had resorted to force, over those which had confined themselves to diplomatic representations. Here was a tempting opportunity of giving the Monroe Doctrine a status in international law; for, by their proposal, not only Great Britain, Germany and Italy, but the other creditor Powers, had evinced a willingness formally to recognize the hegemony of the United States over the Latin-American republics. Not only did Mr. Roosevelt decline the seductive invitation, but he procured the reference of all European demands against Venezuela to The Hague Tribunal.

Deserving of more attention, also, than it received during the campaign was the conclusion of an arbitration treaty between the United States and France. Like the preceding convention between France and England, to which it closely conforms, the treaty excludes from arbitration such controversies as in the judgment of either signatory affect its national honor or vital interests. It is, however, the Executive, not the Legislature, by which such judgment will be exercised, and, consequently, the pressure to be feared from popular excitement will be minimized. The treaty is not an isolated exhibition of a peace-loving spirit, made for campaign purposes. It is but the first of a series which, when completed, will establish similar relations with almost all the Powers of the European Continent, binding us and them to accept arbitration in lieu of war, except in cases of exceptional gravity. It is understood that the series will be crowned with an arbitration treaty between the United States and

Great Britain. There is reason to believe that every one of these beneficent conventions will receive the needed two-thirds vote in the Senate. It is true that the Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Treaty was rejected by that body, but an extraordinary change has since taken place in American sentiment. The lingering suspicion with which Great Britain was still regarded by many of our citizens eight years ago, has been almost entirely dispelled. Of the vindictiveness, for which the lurid accounts of the Revolutionary struggle and of the War of 1812 in our school histories were responsible, there remains scarcely any trace. The sympathetic attitude of the British Government during the two months preceding and throughout our war with Spain, sharply contrasted, as it was, with the ill-disguised antipathy of Continental Europe, went far to efface the memory of far-distant quarrels. If the Senate shall reflect the altered temper of the American people—generally in foreign affairs it is a faithful mirror—it will reverse its former action, and welcome the opportunity of minimizing the chances of collision between the sections of the English-speaking world. At all events, Mr. Roosevelt will have done his part when he shall have submitted a cluster of arbitration treaties to the Senate. He will then have given conclusive proof that the "big stick" which he believes in carrying is not the bludgeon of a bully, but a purely defensive weapon.

If any voices refrained from joining in the chorus of felicitation with which Mr. Roosevelt's success has been greeted by foreign diplomatists, they are those of the representatives of Latin-American republics. Silence on their part was, perhaps, to be expected in view of the President's letter, which was read at the Cuban dinner. We should like to believe that the letter was hastily penned, and that the author did not intend his words to bear the construction which on their face they justify. Until we see the declaration formulated in a message to Congress, we shall persist in hoping that the President cannot have meant to assert that the United States should assume toward our sister commonwealths the function of debt-collector in the interests of foreign Powers. There is also a widespread and growing sentiment among far-sighted Americans that it is difficult to reconcile with the essence of the Monroe Doctrine the precedent lately established in the case of Venezuela. We refer to the fact that, with the countenance of our Government, or, at all events, with-

out any known protest on its part, nearly a third of the customs revenues of La Guayra and Puerto Cabello have been set aside for the payment, not merely of damages due for public wrongs, but also of private debts arising out of contracts. Suppose that the fraction of the customs dues thus sequestrated had been not thirty, but sixty, or even ninety per cent.! Is it not clear that, under such circumstances, Venezuela would be reduced practically to the condition of Egypt? We ourselves have never yet paid the debts due to British merchants which the Congress of the Confederation pledged our States to pay by the treaty of peace concluded in 1783. Shall we admit that on that account Great Britain has against us a standing *casus belli?* It goes without saying that every Latin-American republic should be held to a rigorous account for any insult offered to the flag or the official representatives of a foreign Power, or for any act of violence committed against the person or property of a foreign individual. Reparation for such wrongs may undoubtedly be secured by the temporary occupation of seaports and custom-houses. We suffered Great Britain to apply such a remedy in the case of Nicaragua. That, however, is plainly a different thing from conniving at the confiscation of a republic's indispensable revenue for the liquidation of ordinary debts.

That the United States will have a navy commensurate with the magnitude of their commercial interests may be looked upon as definitely settled by Mr. Roosevelt's triumph at the ballot-box. It now seems probable that, by the end of the President's second term, Congress will have authorized the construction of a navy second only to England's own. That is to say, our strength upon the ocean, which is believed already to surpass Germany's, will exceed even that of France. That no expansion of the regular army need be looked for under Mr. Roosevelt may be inferred from the fact that, although the authorized *cadre,* or framework, is capable of instant adjustment to a hundred thousand soldiers, only about sixty thousand are at present enlisted. Fair-minded men will acknowledge that the existing number is nearly, if not quite, the minimum which should be maintained permanently under the colors, now that we have given hostages to fortune in the shape of Porto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, Samoa and the Philippines.